

Two
LETTERS

WRITTEN

By the Right Reverend

Dr. *Thomas Barlow*,

LATE

Lord Bishop of *Lincoln*,

CONCERNING

JUSTIFICATION

By *FAITH* Only.

To a Minister in his Diocess. Published
from His Lordship's Original Copy.
Together with the Ministers Letters
that Occasion'd them.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *W. Richardson*, for *Thomas
Parkhurst*, at the Bible and Three Crowns,
at the lower end of *Cheap-side*, near
Mercers Chappel, 1701.

2/9
TWO

LETTERS

WRITTEN

By the Right Reverend

Dr. Thomas Barlow,

LATE

Lord Bishop of Lincoln

JUSTIFICATION



By

To a Minister in his Majesty's Palace
near His Majesty's Original Office
To be printed with the Ministers
that Occasioned them

LONDON

Printed by W. Richardson, for Thomas
Barlow, at the Bible and Verse Coffee
at the lower end of Chancery Lane
St. Dunstons Church

THE
PREFACE
TO THE
READER

ALTHOUGH these Letters
of the Learned and Pious
Bishop Barlow, lay long obscure in
the hands of the Widow of the Mi-
nister to whom they were writ. Yet
many Years before I saw them, the
Fame of the First of them had largely
spread it self, nor that many had seen
or read it, nor that all were capable
of Judging of that Learning and
Solid Judgment, which upon this
Publication will be taken Notice of;
But that the Condescension of this
Great Man, was justly admirable,
A 2 even

The Preface

even to those who had not the same Sentiments with the Bishop in the Controversy; a Letter consisting of above Twelve Sheets of Large Paper, in so fair a Copy written with so much Accuracy, for the satisfaction and private use of one Minister: By a Bishop that had so many other weighty Affairs in his hands, is an Instance of Humility, fit to be laid before the Best and Highest men. I know this Controversy hath been Largely handled, and much written of it, especially of late; but perhaps it may not be thought an incongruous expression. If I say, those Letters in regard of the Author, Matter and Stile are fit to be counted a Determination of the whole, and so it will be no Objection that they are written so Scholastically, seeing much of this Controversy is more proper for the Schools than for the Pulpit. The Discourse which occasion'd The Minister's first Writing to the Bishop, was at his Receiving In-

to the Reader.

Institution to that Living, which about Eight Years after I Receiv'd from the same hands (as appears by comparing the date of the first Letter, with the time of his taking possession of it) and it brings to mind a passage on the Bishops private Directions to me on that solemn occasion; speaking of such like questions, (particularly about the Arminian points) Study them, said he, Study them; the Truth lyes on one side, but do not trouble the People with them. And if private Christians, especially of meaner Capacitys, do content themselves with their Bibles and Catechisms, and other good Practical Books, and leave these Polemical Discourses to their Teachers and more Learned Readers; they will best answer the Bishops design in writing, and mine in publishing these Letters. The Minister for whom this Great Bishop was at so much Pains, was eminent in his Place and Day for Serious Godliness and usefulness.

The Preface

ness. His Character is already published to the World, in his Funeral Sermon : But I being to publish (mostly) his blemishes, may be allow'd to conceal his Name. Only that we may excuse him what we can, the Reader is desired to take Notice : that though the Bishop's Letters are Printed from his own fair Original Copy ; yet the Ministers Letters are from a Transcript of a Rough Draught ; and that some expressions in the first, (as is hop'd) might be better worded in the Copy sent to the Bishop : but I think, his Christian Acknowledgment of his fault in the Second Letter, is his best excuse for some appearing Rudeness in the First. I have heard much of what effect the Bishop's Arguments and Humility had upon him, as to his Preaching and Converse, afterwards, but in such General expressions, that I can set down nothing but this, that he often repented that he had spent so much time in Reading the Books (doubtless the

to the Reader.

*the Controversal ones) of that Great
and Holy Man Whose Aphorisms
that come out after the Year 1640.
Seem'd first to the Bishop to deviate
from the Received Opinion in the Re-
formed Churches. This is all that I
have to Advertise the Reader of,*

Ri. Mayo.

A 3

Mr.

to the Reader.
the Countess (l. ones) of that Great
and Holy Alms Whole Abbot
that come out after the Year 1640.
I am left in the Ship to be
from the Received Opinion in the Re-
formed Church. I am in all that I
am to the Reader of.

Ri. Mayo.

Mr. A

for
by
as
to
el
at
to
hy
no
ere
ele
I
I
Pri
of
cor
the
is t
pug
is n
Juf
Spe
own

Mr. J. W's.

First LETTER

TO

Bishop Barlow.

My Lord,

I Have often, and sometimes with sadness, revolv'd what your Lordship said when I was with you, viz. That if any of your Clergy should Print, Write or Preach up the Doctrine of Justification by Works, you would according to a Law in that Case, deprive them *ipso facto*. The Law, I suppose, is the 5th. Canon, that Censures the Impugners of the 39 Articles, in which there is not one Syllable, that I know of, against Justification by Works. For Art. 11th. speaks only against Justification *for our own* Works or Deservings, which is quite another

Mr. J. W's First Letter

another matter. Can it be any Crime for Men to speak as God himself speaks by his Holy Apostle St. James? That a Man is justified by Works. Is this the same as to be justified for our own Works or Deservings, which the Article Condemns? If it be, then the Article confutes St. James. If it be not, then there is no danger to assert, with St. James, Justification by Good Works, and then it deserves no Censure, and then sure not the severe Censure of Deprivation. If the Article had asserted, that we are not justified by Works in any sense, it had made War against Heaven, and I would never subscribe to such an Article, though an Angel from Heaven should Preach it. But God be thanked, there is no such Article. If it be said, that the latter Clause of the Article excludes all justification by Works, when it saith, *Wherefore that we are justified by Faith Only, is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of Comfort, as more largely is express'd in the Homily of justification.* *Answ.* This Clause doth not absolutely and unlimitedly assert justification by Faith Only, (for so it would seem to contradict St. James's saying, *we are justified by Works, and not by Faith Only*) but limitedly, and the limitation is to the larger explication of this Phrase in the Book

to *Bishop Barlow.*

Book of Homilies; therefore thither we must go, to fetch the meaning of it: and this shews the great Wisdom and Moderation of the Contrivers of this Article, that in an assertion where they might seem to oppose the Scripture, they durst not stop, nor let it pass without such a limitation, as will save it harmless. Reverend Dr. Tally, and since him Pious Mr. Troughton, in the Recitation of this Article, have both of them left out the limitation; for what ends they know best themselves. But my Reverend and good Friend and Neighbour, Mr. C. Gataker in his *Harmony Tit. page*, hath honestly and faithfully recited the whole, and I believe he durst not leave out the last Clause, though his cause engag'd him to it, as much as theirs. Now seeing the Article appeals to the Homily to the Homily we will go. And this tells us over and over, that *Justification by Faith Only*, is spoken to exclude the merit of our Works, as being unable to deserve justification at his hands, and thus Faith it self also is excluded *Hom. Justif. pt. 2. p. 17.* which plainly suggests to us a distinction between Faith consider'd as a *Condition* of justification, and as a *Meritorious Cause*. We are not justified by it this latter way, saith the Homily, therefore the former; for
surely

Mr. J. W's. First Letter

surely we are justified by Faith some way or other. Your Lordship and some other Learned Men say, we are justified by Faith as an *Instrument*, not as a *Condition*.

A. 1. If Faith be an Instrument of justification, then 'tis an efficient Cause, which is too high an exaltation of Mans Act or Work. 2. The Book of Homilies saith not a word. and therefore I believe they had not a thought of Faith's Instrumentality, whereas so great stress is laid now a-days. But I humbly conceive, that the dispute about Faith's *Instrumentality* on the one hand, and it's *Conditionality* on the other, is but a strife about words, and that Learned Men on both sides mean the same thing. Though Faith's Instrumentality be the more improper phrase, and the Gospel promise is properly the instrument of Justification; for thereby this benefit, *i. e.* the Right to it is convey'd to us, on Condition of Faith: If we believe we obtain it, if not, we do not.

Obj. But St. Paul excludes and opposes Justification by Works, and then it follows, that we are justified by *Faith Only*, without any consideration of Works or limitation of *Faith Only*. *Answ.* St. Paul opposes Justification by all Works, in the *Jewish* sense of that phrase, *viz.* when Works are held to be Meritorious Causes

of

of Justification, as the *Jews* reputed them to be, and thus *Paul's* meaning is expounded by the Church of *England*, Art. 11. not for our own Works or Deservings. But more plainly, *Hom. pt. 2. of Justif. p. 17. We be justified freely, without all Merit of our own good works, as St. Paul doth express it.* Nothing can be more plain from hence than this, that the Church of *England* and *St. Paul* too, oppose Justification by Works, not in all Senses, for then he must needs oppose *St. James*, that asserts it in a Christian Sense, but only in the Sense of Merit, which was the then *Jewish*, and is the now *Papist* Sense of that phrase; and if any one thus assert it, let him be *Anathema*; For *Christ's Blood* is the only Meritorious Cause of Justification; and they that hold this surely can neither be *Papists* nor *Socinians*, though in some things they agree with both. The *Papists* and We agree in asserting *Christ's Satisfaction*: But differ in that they mingle *Humane Merits* and *Satisfaction* with it. The *Socinians* and We agree in asserting the condition of *Good Works*, as well as *Faith* to justify: But differ in that they exclude *Christ's Righteousness* from being the Meritorious Cause thereof.

Give

Give me leave, My Lord, to suggest one other sense of Justification by *Faith Only*, viz. That we are at first brought into a state of Justification by *Faith Only*. which seems agreeable to Art. 13. and *Hom. Justif. pt. 2. p. 16.* yet we are continu'd in that State by Faith and Works also.

I know it is commonly said, that Faith justifies, and that Faith only justifies: but take them properly and not popularly, and they are dangerous expressions, implying that Man is his own justifier: whereas Justification is the Act and Office of God, and not of Man. *Rom. 8. 33. It is God that justifies.* Whereas if Faith did properly justify it might be truly said, 'tis Man that justifies: for what Faith which is Man's Act doth, Man himself may be said to do. But these phrases as they are not Scripture, (for the Scripture still useth the passive phrase, of *being justified by Faith*, not the active that *Faith justifies*) so neither are they agreeable to our Church, which *Hom. 2. p. 17.* saith; that *Justification is the Office of God only, and that it is not our own Act to believe in Christ, which is within us, that doth justify us, and deserve our Justification to us.* Mark, That this Author in expresse terms denies that

that Faith justifies us, meaning in the Efficient and Meritorious Sense. How contrary is this, not only to Faith's Merit, but it's Instrumentality? For sure, if it were the instrument of justification, it might properly be said to justify us; and justification to be it's Office, and consequently Man's Office, whereas the Homily saith a little above, that *Justification is not the Office of Man, but of God.*

Obj. But Hom. 1. p. 14, 15. saith, that Faith doth not shut out Repentance, Hope, Love, Dread and Fear of God, to be joyned with Faith in every Man, that is justified; but it shuts them out from the Office of justifying; so that though they be all be all present together in him that is justified, yet they justify not altogether, and Faith so excludes Good Works, that we may not do them to this Intent, to be made just by doing them, i. e. to be justified thereby. *Ans.* The Doctrine of Justification by Faith, doth not only shut out all other Virtues from the Office of justifying, but doth also shut out Faith it self from that Office; for p. 17. expressly asserts Justification, to be the Office of God only; and denies that 'tis the Office of Man, and that Faith justifies. Indeed if Faith did justify, Justification must needs be the Office of Man, as much

as

Mr. J. W's. First Letter

as Faith is his Duty : Nor may we do Good Works for this intent, to be made just, or justified by them, *viz.* in a way of Merit, as the Book frequently expounds it self ; and so presently after, *our Justification comes freely, by the meer mercy of God, without any our desert or deserving.* So that the Homily makes it no more the Office of Faith to justifie, than of any other Virtue, which is none at all. But this Doctrine of free Justification by Christian Faith and Works, as Conditions only, excludes all Man's Merits, yea, even of Faith it self, as well as any thing else.

So much to shew that the Assertion of Justification by Christian Works, is not contrary to the Scripture, or to the Church of England. I will crave leave to urge one Argument for it from St. Paul, who is thought to be its greatest Antagonist ; It is this, He that is justified by Faith, and by the repeated acts thereof, is justified by Works. But the Saints are justified by Faith and it's repeated acts. *Er.* They are justified by Works. The Major is prov'd from St. Paul, who twice calls Faith the Work of Faith, *2 Thess. 1. 11.* and *1 Thess. 1. 3.* Therefore so many renewed acts of Faith, so many Works of Faith, The Minor, that we are justified

fied by Faith, which is no more than to be justified by the continued acts of the habit of Faith, is frequently asserted by St. Paul, and granted by all. Therefore the *Conclusion* is good : The Sum is, that if we are justified by Faith, we are justified by a work, and consequently by works, because Faith is a work ; if by believing, then by working, because believing is working, as it must needs be if Faith be a work ; and one would think such an argument unanswerable : But how easily can Learned Men evade it thus : We are justified by Faith, not as it is a work, but as it is an instrument receiving Christ's Righteousness. This answer I have often heard and read, but *pace Doctorem*. 1. It is groundless, in that it hath no Foundation, either of Scripture, or of our Church, or of Reason to support it. There is no such phrase, either in the Bible, or any of our Church-Books. 2. It contradicts it self, in saying, that Faith justifies not as a work, but as it receives Christ's Righteousness. To receive Christ's Righteousness is to do somewhat, *Er.* it is to work. Therefore, if we are justified by Faith, as it receives Christ's Righteousness, we are justified by it as a work : If a Beggar cannot have an Alms, unless on condition that he will

B

stretch

Mr. J. W's. First Letter

stretch forth his hand to receive it, though the Beggar do not work or act or do any thing by giving as the Donor doth, yet sure his Receiving is Doing something, and so far as 'tis Doing any thing, 'tis acting or working. It is nothing to the purpose, and it grants the very thing that it undertakes to dispute against. The assertion is double, 1. That we are justified by Faith, this is granted. 2. That Faith is a work, this is also granted. Therefore there is as much granted as we contend for. Hence we say, it fairly follows, that a Man is justified by works, which is as Natural and Easie a consequence, as it is possible for a Man to make: And yet this proposition is denied *Conjunctim* when it is granted *Divisim*, in the two propositions from whence it so naturally results; which contrary to all Rules of Learning and Reasoning, is to deny the Conclusion, when they are forc't to grant both the premises. Further, let this be our proposition, that a Man is justified by the work of Faith. The Learned Adversaries deny it for this Reason, because we are not justified by Faith, as it is a work: Which is to say somewhat, but much less than nothing; for we do not assert, that a Man is justified by Faith as it is a work. The pro-

proposition is *de re*, whether we are justified by any work: The answer is *de modo rei*, viz. that we are not justified by a work, or works, *as* works; and so is nothing to the present Question, but to another, viz. Concerning the manner of Justification by works. Another case will illustrate it, Let this be the proposition, A Man's Heart is Cheared by drinking *Red Wine*: A Disputant comes forth and undertakes to prove the falseness of this proposition, and in the first place, He tells us what He grants, viz. 1. That the *Wine* is *Red*. 2. That Man's Heart is Cheared by it. Now this is by parts to yeild all that is asserted in the whole proposition, and yet He will deny the whole proposition for this Reason, because a Man's Heart is not Cheared by drinking *Red Wine*, *as* it is *Red*, which the Adversary never yet asserted. Just thus do Reverend Men argue, when they deny Justification by Faith, which is a work. And though they grant Justification by Faith, and grant that Faith is a work, viz. because we are not justified by Faith, as it is a work, which their Adversaries do no where assert, and these are two Questions. 1. Whether we are justified by works in any Sense. 2. How or in what Sense we are so. The Former

Mr. J. W's First Letter

is the Question debated ; and therefore the Answer should be fitted to that, where-as 'tis fitted only to the latter. There are many other assertions and distinctions of these Learned Men, which, if examined are as obnoxious as this, but I will not trouble your Lordship, nor my self with them now. I hope, My Lord, that upon a serious view of what is here said, you will entertain a more Candid opinion of those Learned Men of our own, that have, in an honest and Christian sense, asserted Justification by works, both in the Press and Pulpit, and that are as much against it in the *Jewish* Sense as their Adversaries can be, their being nothing in this Doctrine that is contrary to the Church of *England*, or Scripture, or Reason. I should not have taken the boldness to have sent this Script, if your Lordship had not allowed it, when you required me to write to you, before I should Preach or Publish any thing of this matter ; and also if I had not thought your Lordship too severe in your threatning of Deprivation. Sure, My Lord, you cannot be ignorant that divers Dignitaries of our Church and others, very Pious and Learned Men, and some of them of my Acquaintance, that are of the opinion oppos'd by your Lordship, and divers of them

them have Preached and Printed for it: And God hath blest and prospered their Labours in the Ministry to do much good. Now can it consist with the fam'd Candour and Moderation of your Lordship, to silence and deprive them all, if you had them in your reach, if they should dare to Write or Preach for Justification, by Christian works in any Sense. Alas then, what had become of *Dr. Hammond*, *Dr. Patrick*, *Dr. Tillotson*, *Dr. Stillingfleet*, *Dr. Pierce*, *Dr. Whitbert*, *Mr. Bull*, *Mr. Baxter*, *Mr. Rawlet*, *Dr. Smalwood*, &c. All Men of Great worth and Learning; they must all have been silenc'd by you, had they been in your Jurisdiction, not for opposing the word, nor the Church of *England*, but for opposing your Notions, or not expressing their Minds in your Phrases. At this rate *St. James* and *St. Paul* must have excommunicated each other. And all superiors must Rend and Ruin the Church of *Christ*, if their inferiours will dare to preach any thing against their Set Forms of Speech, though they agree with them in the Main. It hath been no small trouble to me, that so good a Man as you are reputed to be, and I hope, are, should discover such a Spirit, now you are in Power: But I Pray, and hope, that God

will give you to see that it is not according to the Gospel, and that in an Age so cold for Charity and void of good works, nothing can be more needful for us to Preach and Press, than St. *James's* Doctrine, Chap 2. And how that can be done without Preaching up Justification by good works (in a Christian sense, *viz.* as Conditions, not as Meritorious causes thereof) I am not able to imagine. My Lord, I beseech you, believe that it is nothing but my Charity to your Soul, and Honour of your Goodness and Learning, which hath drawn these Lines from me; and for once accept of a Christian admonition from your inferiour, and correct the Sharpness of your foresaid censure, and love and encourage all your Clergy, that Preach and Live well, though they be not of your Mind in extrafundamentals, nor can use your phrases in the explication of every Doctrine, and so you will gain the Love of God and Man, and maintain the Reputation, which you have formerly had, not only of a Learned, but of a Moderate and Candid Person, which that you may do, is the Prayer of,

Your Humble Servant,

Feb. 28. 1677.

J. W.

St.

St. James's Justification by works, is the Pardoning a Man, and continuing him in the State of Pardon, upon the doing of Godly works, that spring from Faith. And what harm is in such Doctrine, I am too weak sighted to perceive: Nor can I think it unlawful for a Minister to take, *James* 2. 21, or 24. for his Text, which if he do, and Preach not up Justification by works, sure he will make a strange Sermon, and yet more strange, if he should from thence Preach against all Justification by any works. That Pardon and Justification are the same thing, is twice asserted in the Book of Homilies, which is clear enough against some *Nestoricks*, that will have Justification to consist in the Pardon of Sin, and imputation of Christ's Righteousness, of which neither Homily, nor Scripture says any thing. From whence your Lordship, I suppose, e're this hath corrected your mistake, when you told us, that imputing Christ's Righteousness was Eleven times us'd in one Chapter, *viz. Rom. 4.* as *Arminius* himself granted. This I was then bold to deny as well knowing the contrary: The same Candour may at once Pardon my boldness, and rectify your own Error. 'Tis not imputing Christ's

Mr. J. W's. First Letter, &c.

Righteousness, but imputing Righteousness, that is there mention'd, which is the same Pardon or Justification: And this for the sake of Christ's Righteousness.

Bishop

Bishop *BARLOW*'s

First LETTER

OF

JUSTIFICATION.

S I R,

I Received, and Read your Letter ;
and was not a little troubl'd (for
your sake) to find so very great
confidence; without any just ground for
it. Considering the circumstances and
condition I am in, in this place. (1. Having
no Books, my Library being at *Bugden*.
2. Being engaged in many publick busi-
nesses. 3. And being for several Weeks,
(by reason of Sickness) confin'd to my
Chamber) I say, these things considered,
I had reason enough to have laid your
Letter aside, and returned no answer :
Especially, seeing you desire none, but
(with a strange confidence) believing
your

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

your Reasons demonstrative, you expect no reply; but (as you are pleased to say) *my Recantation, and Correction of my Errors*. That you and I may Err, will (I suppose) be granted: But the Question is, which of us Errs, in this particular, whether you, *who assert Justification by our own works, and inherent Righteousness*, or I, *who deny it*? For the clearing of this Question, for manifesting that you are much mistaken, (with my Reasons, why I think you are so) for the Love I bare to Truth and You, and that I may (according to my Place and Duty) in all Meekness endeavour your Restitution to the knowledge and belief of the Truth; I have writ and sent these Papers, with my Prayers that the Good God of Heaven and Earth, would be graciously pleased, so to bless you, that (all prejudice laid aside) you may impartially seek Truth, and (when found) believe it. In short, I conceive you have *injur'd me*, (and *your self more*) *mistaken my words, the plain words of our Articles, our Homilies and Scripture it self, (even every Text of it, by you cited)*. That all this may (as I hope it will) evidently appear, I say,

I. That in your Letter, (of which I suppose you keep a Copy, and may find it Truth I say) you have *accus'd, severely censured,*

censur'd, and Catagorically Condemn'd me of Errors in Divinity; without hearing my Apology, how shall I state my position, or the reasons of it. Now had I been your Subject and Inferior, and you my Ordinary and Tryal Judge, yet so Rashly to Condemn me, had been evidently unjust. Even Pagans (by the Light of Nature) knew and confessed, that he who Condemns any (as you have done me) unheard, equum licet Statuerit, haud equus fuit. But to Condemn your Superior, your Ordinary and Legal Judge (as you know and confess I am) and that causa indicta & inaudita, this seems to me (and Wise-men) much more unjust; and possibly (on Second thoughts) may seem so to you too. Besides, I have lived longer (and not very idly) in an Universality, then you have lived in the World: And some Sober Men think, that my Age and Education (as well as my Authority) might have been some Motive to your Modesty, not so confidently to Condemn (before you heard) me.

2. But you say: 'You had not taken the Boldness to have writ this Script: 'if I had not allowed it, when I required of you to write to me, before you Preach'd, or Published any thing of this matter. To this I say. 1. It is evident, (and cannot

2.

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

not be denied) that you have taken an unusual, and (circumstances consider'd) an unbecoming *Boldness*. 2. But that I allow'd it, is a manifest untruth, injurious to me and to your self: I did indeed desire, (not, as you word it, require) that if you, (or any of my Brethren) had any objection against any Article of our Religion, that you would not Preach or Print, or Publickly urge it, (unless you could clearly answer it) because it would be incongruous and scandalous, to Preach or Print, or dispute against those Articles, we had solemnly subscribed. My desire therefore was; that (in case you had any such objections, or doubts) you would communicate your Reasons of your doubts to me, and possibly I might help to answer them, and satisfy you. But if not, we would (as we ought) go to our Superiors for Satisfaction, and not Preach Print, or dispute publickly against any part of our established Doctrines. This I said to you, and (as I have opportunity) I do say to all my Brethren. But certainly neither you, nor any impartial Persons (who consider what they say) can think, that by saying this, (and more I never said) I allow'd you to accuse, prejudice, and (as you have done) peremptorily to

con-

condemn me of actual errors, and misunderstandings of our Articles. This in the general.

3. But that I may come to shew you your particular mistakes, (which are very many, and not easily pardonable, in one, who (with so much confidence) undertakes to instruct, correct and censure his Superiors) you begin your Letter with an untrue recitation of some words, which (though never spoke by me) you mis-calmine. The Passage in your Letter is this.—— ‘When I was with your Lordship, you said, that if any of your Clergy, should Print or Preach up the Doctrine of Justification by Works, you would (according to a Law in that case) deprive him, *ipso facto*. And then you add,—— ‘The Law (I suppose) is the 5th. Canon, which censures the Impugners of our 39 Articles. When 1. I never said to you (or any of my Brethren) that I would deprive them *ipso facto*, in that case mention’d, and therefore, for you to say I did, is a mistake, and a manifest untruth. 2. ’Tis also a great mistake for you to suppose, (as you do) that the Law for deprivation, in the 5th. Canon of our Church. For there is not one word in that Canon, (or in any other I remember) of any deprivation, much less

3.

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

less deprivation *ipso facto*: That Canon mentioning only Excommunication *ipso facto*. Which had you consulted and consider'd the Canon, (as you ought) you could not (as you are) have been guilty of so great a mistake. 3. To call that Canon a Law, is a mistake too; and an argument, that you do not well understand the true, and (to the Learned) the known difference of those two words. For *νόμος* and *νόμος*, Canons and Laws, have a different signification: which you could not have been ignorant of, had you known and consider'd *Justinians* Novel Constitution, in confirmation of the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiae universalis*, and *Justellus* his Notes upon it. I cite not the place in that Book, least I might seem to think, that a Person of your undertaking and confidence, should not be well acquainted with that Book, which (next the Bible) is the most Authentick, and (by the Catholick Church) the most approved and recieved Book in the World. 4. That which I said to you, and (as I have opportunity) do say to all my Brethren is this, — I desire them not to Print or Preach any thing against our Articles, which we have (or should have) subscribed. For by the Canon of our Church, the punishment for so doing, is

^a Constit. Ecclesiast. i Jac. Can. 5.

is Excommunication, *ipso facto*, (not deprivation *ipso facto*, as you mistake) And by our Law and Statute^b deprivation. ^{I^b Statut. 13. Elizab. Cap. 12.} do say also, that to Preach up Justification by our own works, and inherent Righteousness, is directly against the Articles of our^c Church: And I think, I said^c to you, and I am sure, I have (and shall say it, to my Brethren, (when I have an opportunity, and conceive it necessary) to put them in mind of their Duty; that if they Print or Preach any thing contrary to our Articles, I must be necessitated, to execute the Punishment (Excommunication) threatned in the Canon. Yet I never have, nor shall do it, till instructions, admonitions, and all milder means fail. *Cuncta prius tentanda*: But if any reject these, and prove contumacious; *Immedicabile vulnus ense rescidendum, ne pars sincera trahatur*. This I have said, and do now say it again, and it will concern you (notwithstanding all your confidence) to remember it.

4. But to let all these pass, you add, —
‘That in the 39 Articles, there is not one
‘Syllable you know of, against Justifi-
‘cation by works. For (say you) Article
‘11 speaks only against Justification by
‘our own works, or deservings, which is
‘quite another matter. These are your
words,

words, which (I confess) I wonder at, and shall give you the reason why I do so.

1. When you say ; ' That you know 'not one Syllable, in the 39 Articles, against Justification by works. I must admit that, for I will not say you know, what you say, you know not. But sure I am, you might, and ought to have known more than one Syllable, in those Articles, against Justification by works ; as shall presently appear.

2. When you argue thus, ' There is nothing in our 39 Articles against Justification by works, because there is nothing in the 11th Article. This is evidently inconsequent. For admit (which is manifestly untrue) that there were not one Syllable to the purpose, in the 11th Article ; yet there may be, (and really is) something in the 12th Article. If I should (against you) argue thus, There is nothing in the first Chapter of *James* for Justification by works: *Go.* there is nothing in his Epistle. This (I am sure) you would deny, (and well you might) as irrational and ridiculous ; and if you consider, and consult your Logick, you will find your own consequence no better.

3. Your Argument, such as it is, (a reason I cannot call it) is in Form thus,
The

The *11th* Article speaks only against Justification by our *own works*, or deservings: *ergo*. There is not a Syllable against Justification by *works*. Which is all one, as if you should say; the Article speaks against Justification by our works or deservings. *ergo*. It does not speak against Justification by works. Or, it does this. *ergo*. It does it not.

4. You say, 'That Justification by our own works and deservings, is quite another thing from Justification by works. That is, Justification by works, is not Justification by works. This is evidently the Sense of your words, (if they have any, as certainly they have not) which may deserve Commiseration and Pitty, rather than a Serious Confutation. These are the direct consequences of your words, and must be, till you have better explained them.

But to let this pass, I shall endeavour, (and, I hope, be able) to make it evidently appear, that you greatly mistake the true meaning of our Articles, Homilies, and the Scriptures too. And here, I begin with the *11th*. Article, (of which alone you take notice) and shall shew you, 1. The true meaning of it. 2. And (though you say no) that it makes directly

ly against Justification by works, or by any inherent Righteousness.

5. For the former of the two mentioned particulars, (the true meaning of the 11th Article) we have these things *in terminis*, and expressly declared in that Article.

1. That it is Justification *coram Deo*, Before God, of which that Article speaks; or what it is which clears us, (both from Guilt and Punishment) at God's Tribunal: For 'tis confess'd, that works do justify, *coram hominibus*.

2. That it is only the Merits of our Blessed Saviour, which does this. We are accounted Righteous before God, (says our Article) *only* for the Merits of Christ. That's the affirmative part; and then the Negative part follows, We are not accounted Righteous before God, for our *own works* or *Deservings*. Neither Faith (says our 1st Homily) nor Hope, nor Charity, nor all the good works we do, or (while we are in *via*) can do, will, or can justify us at God's Tribunal.

3. We have the means expressed, by which our Blessed Saviours Merits and Righteousness become ours; and that is *Only Faith*. We are Righteous before God (says our Article) for the Merits of Christ,

a Hom. p. 13.
Pt. 1. & p. 17.
Edit. 1635.

Christ, By Faith. And it adds, *Only by Faith*. So that if our Church (in her Article) say true; *Meritum Christi, Remissionem peccati, & justificationem Solum meretur & impetrat & Fides Sola est medium, instrumentum & manus Anima, qua Christi meritum cognoscat, apprehendat & sibi applicet*. It is our Blessed Saviours Merit Only, for which we are accounted Righteous before God, neither Faith, nor Works,, have (or can have any hand in that: And 'tis Faith Only, which (as the condition on our part) gives us a Right and Title to that Merit, all works, (in what Sense soever) excluded.

6. This being evidently the meaning of the Article; that it makes (as evidently) against all Justification by works, (which was the Second thing proposed) may, and will appear thus, *Quod Justitiam nec impetrat, nec Christi merita applicat, illud peccatorem non Justificat. Sed bona opera, nec Justitiam impetrant, nec meritum Christi applicant. ergo*. The proposition is evident, because our Church (in her Articles or Homiles, of which we now speak) never acknowledges, or once mentions any other means to concur to the compleat Justification of a Sinner, *coram Deo*; but only *meritum Sponsi Christi*,

Christi, & fides peccatoris. We are justified before God, (says our Article) *Only* for the Merits of Christ, and by *Faith Only*. Which could not possibly be true, if our works did justify us either way: Either by meriting our Justification, or by applying, and (as a condition on our part) giving us a Right to our Blessed Saviours Satisfaction, which does Merit it.

7. But you do not like this expression, that Faith should be call'd an Instrument, in the business of Justification. For (say you) if Faith be an Instrument of our Justification, then 'tis an efficient cause, which is too high an exaltation of Man's act or work. And 2^d you say, 'That the Book of Homilies saith not one word of it, and therefore you believe that they had not a thought of Faith's Instrumentality. This (with confidence) you say; but (without any Proof of your position) you only say it. And that you may see, how far from Truth and Logick such sayings are: I shall (for your better information) 1. Explain their meaning, who call Faith an Instrument, and the ground and Truth of it. 2. The invalidity, and manifest inconsequence of your objections.

1. Then,

1. Then, seeing it is certain, that every Instrument must have Relation to the principal efficient cause, which useth it ; Those who call Faith an Instrument in the Business of our Justification, explain their meaning thus. *Fides non est Instru-*

mentum Dei, propter Sola Christi merita Justificantis : Sed Animæ, meritum Christi apprehendentis & sibi applicantis. They

say, that *Fides viva est medium, manus, Organon seu Instrumentum* : The *b Only*

means, hand, or instrument of the Soul, lays hold upon, receives, applies, and relies upon the Merits and Satisfaction of our Blessed Saviour (all works excluded) for Remission of Sins, and Justification,

coram Deo. And this they say, warranted by express Scripture, which expressly says, That *το πιστεω*, is, (and signifies) *το*

χρυσον λαμβανειν : (*Redere est Christum Recipere*, that Faith only receives Christ.

To as many as Received him (says John) *he gave power to become the Sons of God, even to them that Believed on his Name.*

Other such places there are, which I shall neither cite nor press now, because (I suppose) they are, (or may, or should be) known to you. And this is a truth so evident, that Sober Papists confess it, (though as much as you, for Justification by works, and more then you or they

b Fieri Non Parest, n. redemptorem unicum, & expiatorum peccatorum Jesum Christum Alia Ratione, Quam Fide accipimus & apprehendamus; Operibus enim apprehendi non potest.

Luther, Operū Tom. 5. Germ. Jen. Fol. 298. vid. with Biddembachium, in Exam. prop. 22. Confess Augustinianæ Hieron. Torrensis Jesuitæ.

a Joh. 1. 12. and Col. 2 5.6. And Joh. 6. 35. to believe in Christ is to receive him ; so as to have everlasting life by him, v. 40.

47.

b Tolet in 3 ad.
Rom. Annota.
77. p. 451. in
Col. 1.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

TOLETIN 210. 11.

should be) to omit others; *Cardinal Tolet* does acknowledge, *Quod Fides est gratia Recipiendæ Organum*, the Instrument of the Soul, which *Receives* grace. 3. But to let this pass; sure I am, that it is the constant Doctrine of Protestant Divines (both on this side, and beyond the Seas) to omit others; I shall give you the Judgment of one, (who hitherto has had, and deserved the Name of *Judicious*) *Mr. Hooker* I mean, who (in the Name of the Church of *England*) expressly declares against you; not only in this particular, but against your whole Hypothesis of Justification by works. His words, (worthy your consideration) are these, *It is* (saith he) *a Childish Caviel our Adversaries use*, (Papists he means, for none pretending to be the Sons of our Church then used it) *exclaiming, that we require nothing in Christians, but Faith*: Because we say, *Faith alone* justifies. Whereas, by this speech, we never meant to exclude Hope or Charity, from being always joyned, and *Inseparable Mates* with Faith, in the Man justified; or works from being *Added*, and *Necessary Parts*, required of every justified Man. But to shew, that *Faith* is the *Only Instrument*, which putteth on Christ unto justification, and

Christ

Christ the *Only Garment*: which being put on, hides the imperfections of our works, makes us blameless *in the sight of God*, before whom otherwise, *The weakness of Our Faith*, were sufficient to shut us out of Heaven. So Judicious *Hooker*, and the Church of *England* then. Which passage of him, when you have consider'd, and that Tract of Justification in which it is, you may, (and I hope, will) find good Reason to allay your confidence, and convince you, that Justification by works, was not then (nor could be now) taken for Truth in the Church of *England*.

4. And for the particular, we are now speaking of, that *Faith alone* in the hand or instrument, which apprehends and applies the Satisfaction of our Blessed Saviour, for Remission of Sins, and our Justification, the Doctrine of our Church is certain and evident. For thus our Homily (which we have solemnly subscribed)

We must never cease, till we have apprehended and taken hold of Christ: But this must be done by Faith. For sith God is a Spirit, he can By no other means be apprehended, or taken hold upon. And elsewhere more fully, (if that be possible) it being certain, (and confess'd) that we are accounted Righteous before God, Only for the Merits of Christ (as it is expressly

*d Files est or-
ganum. & velu-
ti manus anima
qua Dei benefi-
cia suscipimus.
Came co in
Joh. 6. 29. And
tis the Judg-
ment of all the
Protestants in
Germany. Cen-
tissimum est Re-
missionem pec-
catorum Non
posse accipi, sola
fide. Liber Con-
cordiæ p. 152.
Lipsiæ 1580.
subscribed by
above 8000
hands.*

*The 1. part
of the Homily
of Repentance.
p. 258.*

C 4

In the B. of
Hom. in the
2 Ser. of the
Passion. p. 186

ibid. p. 187.

h Justitia Dei
nobis applicatur
per fidem Christi
& fides est ap-
plicatio & con-

junctio Justitia Christi nobiscum. Quilibet Justificatur Tantum per fidem Christi. Cajetan. in Rom. 3. 22. Mors Christi nobis applicatur per fidem. Solum per Sanguinem Christi possunt remitti peccatum; sed virtus Sanguinis operatur per fidem. And again, Justitia Dei per fidem Christi, quia prima motus mentis ad Deum per est fidem. Anguinas in 3. ad Galat. Lect. 3. Itam Naclautus, in Rom. 3. 22. p. 194. yet all Papists.

pressly in our 11th Article) Our Church puts the Question; how those Merits must be applied, and made ours? For (says the Homily) as a Salve doth not profit a man, unless it be applied to the part infected; So the Death of Christ profits not, unless we apply it, in such sort as God hath appointed. For God commonly works by means; and the means he hath appointed, to apply Christ's Merits in Faith; which is there prov'd by many Texts of Scripture. And it is further there added, that Faith is the *only means*, required on our part for Salvation, (or Justification, for that is there meant, as shall anon appear). In short then, the meaning of those Divines, who call Faith an Instrument in the business of our Justification, is plainly this, *Fides non est Instrumentum Dei propter Christi merita Justificantis, sed Instrumentum Anima fidei meritum Christi, ad Justitia applicantis.*

And this is a Truth so evident, that (as I said before) Sober Papists see and confess it, as by the *h* Margent may appear.

2. Next you object against Faith's being an Instrument, when you say, 'That this would be too high an exaltation of it, it being Man's act and work. Now 1. This (as usually) you only say: Without any pretence of Proof; and then I may reply; (as *Hierome* did in the like case) *eadem facilitate contemnitur, qua proponitur.* 2. Why is it too great an exaltation for Faith (an Act of ours) to say, it is the hand, or instrument of the Soul, which receives Christ, and applies him (as a most Sovereign Salve) to Cure our Souls wounded with Sin? What exaltation is it of a Beggars hand, to say it receives a Thousand, or Ten Thousand pounds from his Benefactor? Or for a great Criminal's hand to receive a free Pardon from his Prince? Faith (as a hand or Instrument of the Soul) does no more; and (if our best Divines, or Church, or Scripture may be believ'd) it does no less. Faith, (and Faith only) can know, apprehend, receive and apply Christ and his Merits; this our Church acknowledges, and expressly affirms, (as you shall see anon) nor can this be truly call'd (as you mistake) too high an exaltation of Faith. For Scripture says as much of it, and more. 1. By Faith (says the i Sacred Text) we receive Christ, and i John 1. 12 are

k Gal. 3. 20.

l Heb. 10. 38

m Act. 10. 43.

n Joh. 3. 18.

o Rom. 3. 28.

p Rom. 5. 1.

q Joh. 7. 38. 39.

r Rom. 5. 1.

s Joh. 3. 16.

are made the Sons of God. 2. By Faith & Christ Lives in us, and we Live. 3. By Faith we receive Remission of all our Sins. 4. And freedom from Condemnation. 5. And Justification. 6. By Faith we receive the Holy Spirit. 7. And Peace with God. 8. And Eternal Life. So that (the premises consider'd) you have little Reason (I am sure you bring none) to say that it is too high an exaltation of Faith, nor say it is an instrument, (in the Sense before explained) in the Business of our Justification. 30. But I might have saved this Labour to prove that they who call Faith an instrument, do not too highly exalt it, (as you pretend) for a little after, you confute your own objection (and your self) when you say, That the dispute about Faith's being a Condition, (as you would have it) or an instrument, (as others) is but a Strife about words; because Learned Men, (on both sides) mean the same Thing. Now if this be true, (and you say it is) then it evidently follows; that they, (of which number you are one) who call Faith a Condition, do too highly exalt it, as much as they, who call it an instrument. Seeing (upon your own Principles) both say the same thing, of the same Act of Faith. And therefore, they who call it a Condition, (as you do) must too highly exalt it, as well as they who

who call it an instrument. Now, If both exalt it too highly (as by your Logick they must) then you are to blame for calling it a Condition; as well as they who call it an instrument. But if neither be to blame, then surely, they who call it an instrument are not. And thus, (though I believe you intended it not) you have clearly shown the vanity and inconsequence of your own objection. / In your Letter page 1.

4. But you further say, / 'That the Gospel promise is the instrument of Justification properly. And therefore you would infer, that Faith is not. But here, 1. This you only say, (as is usual with you) without any pretence of proof. 2. Admit it be as you say, yet *Quod hoc ad Iphitli bones?* It is altogether impertinent. For 3. If the promise in the Gospel, (in which there are many promises, and you tell us not which you mean) be an instrument of our Justification; yet it must (of necessity) be *Instrumentum Dei promittentis*. He only is the principal efficient cause of the promise; and *ergo* if the promise be an instrument, it must be so in respect of God only, who gives us that promise, and useth it as a motive and means of our Faith and Justification by it, and not in respect of Man; who neither is (nor can be) the principal efficient cause, using that Divine promise as

his

his Instrument, and giving vertue and activity to it : Which man must do, if he be the principal cause; and that Divine promise his Instrument. For 'tis certain in Philosophy, that *causa Instrumentalis agit Solum in virtute cause principalis*. Now you do (or should) know that the Question is not, of the conditions or instruments of Justification, *ex parte Dei Justificantis*, but *ex parti hominis Justificati*. So that if the Gospel promise (or what else you will) be (in respect of God) an Instrument; yet this hinders not, but Faith may be (what evidently it is) the hand and instrument of the Soul, whereby it applies and relies solely on the sufferings and satisfaction of our Blessed Saviour, for Justification before God, at his Tribunal. And that Faith is such an instrument, the Church of *England* expressly tells us, as presently (by what follows) will appear.

3. When you say, 'That the Homilies have not one Word, and therefore you believe that they (the Authors of the Homilies you must mean, else it is not Sense, for the Homilies neither have, nor can have, any thoughts) had not a thought of Faiths Instrumentality. To this I say, 1. That your Inference here is very strange, and evidently inconsequent. They have not a word,

therefore

therefore, (you believe) they had not a thought of Faith's Instrumentality. 'Tis certain, (though words be or should be, *signa conceptuum*, expressions of our thoughts) yet men may have many thoughts, which they never express'd by any words : And *ergo*. the Authors of our Homilies, might have had thoughts of the Instrumentality of Faith, though (in words) they never expressed them. 2. But when you (*pro more tuo*) confidently say, That our Homilies have not a word of the Instrumentality of Faith, it is (to me) an evident argument, that either you have not Read our Homilies, or not consider'd, or forgot them : I though having subscribed, and so acknowledge the Truth of them, an Obligation lay upon you, both to Read and Remember them. For if you subscribed before you Read them, you subscribed you know not what, which is a Criminal Impudence, especially in matters of Religion, which so nearly concern your Soul. But if you had Read, and not Remember'd them ; it was great temerity to say, so confidently, (as you do) That they had not one word of Faith's Instrumentality ; unless you were sure it was so. 3. But (which highly aggravates, and makes your confidence inexcusable) it is so far from Truth (that our Homilies have not one

† In the 2 Ho.
of the Passion,
in the 2. part
of the Homily.
p. 187.

¶ *ibid.* p. 188.

¶ p. 187.

¶ Hom. part 1.
p. 27.

one word of the Instrumentality of Faith) that in one Homily and one Folio of it, it is twice expressly, and *in terminis* said.

1. That the *Only means and instrument* of Salvation, required on our Part, is Faith. And a little after, (having said, that the means by which we apply Christ's

Merits, was Faith) It follows, "Let us then use that *means* which God has appointed, in his word, to wit, the means of Faith, which is the *only instrument of Salvation now left unto us.*" 4. And here,

(that you may not mistake) by Salvation, in both the passages now cited, Justification is meant; (and not Eternal Salvation in Heaven) as is evident by these, and several places in our Homilies: Particularly in the former place and page; where Salvation by Faith, is the same thing, which a little after, is call'd Righteousness, or Justification by Faith: And so the Homily of Salvation, is (in our 11th Article) call'd the Homily of Justification. 5. But you cite our Homily,

(and bid me mark it) in which (you say) "The Author in express terms, denies Faith to justify us, either in the efficient or meritorious Sense; which is contrary both to the Merit, and Instrumentality of Faith." Well, I have (as you desire) mark'd it, more diligently than you have

you say, I have mark'd it more diligently than you have

done.

done. For 1. If this prove any thing, it is, that our Homilies contradict one another. For 'tis evident, by what is before said) that our Homily expressly says, that Faith is the *only instrument* of our Justification; and then, if the Homily you cite, do (as you pretend) deny it, it denies here, what it elsewhere affirms; and so our Homilies contradict themselves, and then you (who have subscribed them as truth) did irrationally subscribe contradictions; and our Church worse, which requires subscription. 2. But 'tis certain, that either you did not seriously Read, or misunderstood the page you cite. For 3. There is not in that page, (or any other) any thing against the Instrumentality of Faith. It is there said, 1. That *to justify, is the Office of God*. He is the Sole principal efficient cause of our Justification, which is most true, nor does any pretend that Faith is such a cause. 2. It is said also in the Homily, that our Blessed Saviour only justifies us by way of Merit, and therefore Faith has no Instrumentality in our Justification that way. 3. But it is so far from denying, that it expressly affirms, that Faith is the *only instrument* of the Soul, by which it applies our Blessed Saviours Merits, &c. And this is that Instrumentality

Hom. part 1.
p. 28, 29. &
alibi passim.

mentality which the Homily, expressly ascribes to Faith, and which we contend for; and so should you too, did you Read, and believe the Homilies you have subscribed. The premises consider'd, I further say,

1. That as you may manifestly see, so (I hope) you will ingeniously confess your too confident mistake, in saying, that our Homilies have not one word of Faith's Instrumentality: When in one Folio the Homily expressly, and *in terminis*, tells us, that *God in his word, has appointed Faith, to be the only instrument of our Justification, coram Deo.*

2. Though you dislike it, (as an improper Speech) that Faith should be call'd an Instrument; and (you know not why, for you neither do, nor can give any just Reason for it) would have it call'd a Condition, rather than an Instrument; yet (I hope) for the future, you will not pretend to be wiser than your Mother the Church of England; nor dislike those expressions, which she thought fit to use in her publick Homilies.

3. But let Faith be call'd a Condition, as you would have (and no Body denies) it; and seeing our Homily expressly says, that it is *on our part, the only means and instrument of our Justification before God.*

Hence

Hence, it evidently follows, (in contradiction to your Novel Hypothesis) that our good works neither are, nor can be any *means, condition or instrument* (on our part) of such Justification. For if Faith be the *only means*, (and our Church in the Homily affirms it) then (to be sure) good works are not. In short, if either you (or any body else) could shew me, that our good works are (in Scripture, in the Primitive Fathers, in the publick received Doctrine of our own, or any Reform'd Church in *Christendom*) declared to be any condition, instrument, or antecedent means of our Justification before God; upon the doing whereof (as you say) our Sins are pardon'd, and we *coram Deo* justified. I say, could you shew me this, (I am sure you have not) I should have a better opinion of your Ability and Hypothesis. But till that be (which never can be) done, I must think of both, as they deserve.

8. Though you take no notice of our 12th. Article, when you say, 'There is nothing in our 39 Articles against Justification by works.' Yet had you (as you ought) consider'd it, you would, (or might have found good Reason, to abate your great confidence in that assertion. For the 12th Article, says expressly, 1. That

D

good

good works follow after Justification, (which *Augustine* laid long before (and the Church approved it) *Bona opera non antecedant Justificandum, sed sequuntur Justificatam.*) Now if good works follow Justification (as *St. Augustine*, and our Church say) then (to be sure) they neither do, nor can justify. Unless you will say, (which is highly irrational) they do that, which was antecedently, and before actually done : That which (as a condition) justifies ; must (of necessity) preceed Justification ; and *ergo*, that which follows after, cannot possibly do it. For that were to give being to a thing, which was actually in being before : Or for the effect to produce its cause. Now you, (and all men) know, that such sayings are not Truths, but Contradictions. 2. That Article expressly says, That good works are fruits of Faith, by which a Lively Faith (and so our Justification) may be as evidently known, as a Tree by its Fruit. Now as good Fruit does not constitute, but pre-suppose and declare the Tree to be antecedently good : So (in the judgment of our Church) our good works are not causes or conditions, which constitute a man just ; but effects and evidences, which demonstrate him to have been before actually justified. 3. This

Truth, [That good works pre-suppose the Man who does them antecedently just] has evident ground in a Scripture; ^a 1 Joh. 2. 3; which will justify our Churches Doctrine 5. & chap. 3; in this Article, (consult the places in the ver. 10. 14, 18; Margent, and judge impartially) and in 29. and chap. 4. 7. Eph. 2. our Homily, where it is more fully de- 10. See our Ho: clared, thus, Let us do good works, (says part 2. p. 81, the Homily) and thereby declare our 82. Faith to be Lively and Christian. And ^b In the 3. pt. of the Hom. of Faith, p. 28, 29: a little after. *True Faith ever brings forth good works, saith St. James, shew me thy Faith by thy Deeds. Thy Deeds and Works must be an open Testimonial of thy Faith, otherwise thy Faith is a Phantasie, and but a Faith of Devils.* So that our Church and St. James (whose meaning you much mistake, as shall anon appear) agree in this, that good works are evidences and declarations of a Lively Faith, and preceeding Justification; and so cannot constitute, but only (*ex post facto*) declare a Man antecedently just. Hence it is, that our Church elsewhere says expressly ^c In the 1. pt. of the Hom. of Salvation, pa: That we may not do good works, with this intent, *to be made just by doing them.* 19. Were good works (*conditio Novi faderis*) the condition of the Gospel Covenant, by which we are justified, as much as by Faith (which you affirm) then (next God's Glory) the principal end, for

which we were to do them, should be that we might be justified by them; (the end why we perform the condition of any Covenant, being to obtain that, which on such condition is promis'd in the Covenant: So in the Covenant of works; *Fac hoc, viues*, Life promis'd and was the end why obedience was to be perform'd.) and yet our Church (in that Homily) tells us, That we must not do them to that end, to be justified by doing them. And elsewhere the Authors of our Homilies, particularly setting down, the ends for which good works are to be done; Justification is not at all mention'd, as one of them: Which yet (if your Hypothesis were true) should have been the first, and most principal end of all. The words of the Homily I

d Hom. 2. pt.
p. 81. 82.

mean, are these, *No man doth good works to receive grace by them, but because he has first received grace, he doth consequently do good works.* For (as St. Augu-

e Augustin. de
Diversis qua est
ad simpl. lib. 1.
Quest. 28. &
de fide & Ope-
ribus, Cap 4.
these places
are cited in
the Homilies.

stine's faith) good works do not go before, but follow after, when a man is first justified. St. Paul therefore teacheth (so it there follows) that we must do good works, for divers ends. 1. To shew our obedience; 2. Because they are good Declarations and Testimonies of our Justification. 3. That

others

others seeing our good works, may Glorify God, &c. Thus far the Homily. So that if our Church understood St. Augustine or St. Paul aright, good works are not to be done, to that end, *that we may be justified by them.* All you say to this, is, *that we are not to do good works to that end, to be justified by them, so as by their Merits and Deservings.* Where I do (and would have you to) consider,

1. That by this you say, you do (in part) confirm, what you pretend and endeavour to confute. For you say, *we are not to do good works, to be justified by their Merit,* and therefore (in that respect) you establish that position of the Homily, *that we may not do good works, to be justified by them.* Now 'tis certain, a partial confirmation of any position, is no confutation, or answer to it.

2. You should then, (to maintain Justification by works, to be Consonant to our Homilies, and the Doctrine of our Church) have proved, that good works are (in some respect approved by our Church) *media ad Justitiam ordinata*, previous means or conditions, on performance whereof, (as you say) *our Sins are pardon'd, and we justified.* So that we might do them (in that respect) with an intent to be justified by them. But this,

you neither do, nor indeed can do. For,

f In the Hom.
of Salvation,
pt. 1. p. 14.

3. If good works were (in any respect) *media ad Justitiam*, then they would be required of us, and we ought to do them to that end; which the Church of England expressly denies. For the Author of our Homilies, having cited some places out of the Romans, Cap. 3. and 8. and 10. They add these words, f therefore St. Paul declares, that *nothing on the behalf of Man, concerning his Justification, is required, but only a true and Lively Faith*. If this be true, (and our Church thinks it is, and says, that St. Paul thought so too) then it will evidently follow, that our good works are not *media ad Justitiam*; not means and conditions to be performed by us, to that end, that we may be justified by them. For if *nothing on our part*, be required to our Justification *coram Deo*, but *only a Lively Faith*, then 'tis certain and manifest, that good works are not so required.

Dub.

It is true, that our Homily in the same place, says, That St. Paul shutteth out the Justice of Man, i. e. The Justice of our works, as to *Merit*, or *Deserve* our Justification: (and *ergo*, it may seem, he shuts them out only as Meritorious.

Egl.

To this objection, (which has no Reason, and indeed little shew of it) I say,

1. That

1. That when our Homilies were made, (which was (as I remember) 1. Edward 6. Anno.Dom. 1547. the Preachings and writings of our Divines, were principally directed against Popery. 2. The Papists maintain'd Justification by works, as they were Meritorious *ex condigno, vel ex congruo*. 3. The Protestant Divines then, (and I wish they had all done so still) denied all Justification *coram Deo*, by works, any way consider'd, either with, or without Merit. 4. And this is the reason, why both in our Articles and Homilies, (and all Protestant Writers of those Times) the Merit of works is so industriously, and constantly oppos'd and condemn'd; they having no other Adversaries, who maintain'd Justification by works any other way. (For the *Socinian* Doctrine (unless by few) was not then known, (much less believ'd) and publickly profess'd) so that having seclud'd Merit, the Authors of our Homilies conclude, that we are justified by Faith only, without the concurrence of works, in any consideration, either as with Merit, or without it. 5. But you say (in your Letter, page 1. 'That St. Paul opposeth Justification by works, in the Jewish Sense only, who held Merit of works. 1. This you say indeed, but (without any pretence of proof) you say

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

it only. 2. And you did wisely, not to attempt a work you could not perform. For 3. There is nothing in the Scripture, (and other Authentick evidence, I know none) that the *Jews* held works to be Meritorious, or that they could Merit Justification by them. If you think otherwise, make it appear, that they (in *St. Paul's* time, for what they did before or after his time is impertinent) held such opinion of Merit. 4. *St. Paul* in his 14 Epistles, has nothing of Merit, (not so much as the word, at least, I have not found it; if you have pray inform me) and is it possible he should write against Merit only, and yet never mention it? 5. But what you say here, that *St. Paul* disputes only against the Merit of works, in our Justification, is a contradiction to the Doctrine of our Church, and (in her Judgment, though you think otherwise) to *St. Paul's* Doctrine too; as will (I hope) evidently appear by what follows. 6. Though you say, that *St. Paul* and our Church (in her Homilies) do dispute against works, (in the business of Justification) only as they are pretended to be Meritorious: yet in the Judgment of our Church, (grounded on *St. Paul's* Doctrine) works are absolutely excluded, from having any hand in our Justification before

before God; whether they be consider'd with Merit, or without it. This is manifestly the meaning of the passages of our Homilies before cited; which I shall entirely set down, and desire you impartially to consider. The words are these, *g g* In the 1. pt. of the Hom. of Salvation, p. 1. part 1. The Justice of God is not shut out, in our Justification; But only the Justice of Man, that is, the Justice of our works, as to be Merits of our Justification. Here all Merits of works is secluded; and this done, the Authors of that Homily immediately conclude. Therefore, St. Paul declares here, that *nothing on the behalf of Man*, concerning *his Justification*, but *only a Lively Faith* is required. Where it is evident, 1. That *on our behalf*, Faith is required. 2. And *only Faith*. 3. And *nothing else*, to our Justification! Which being granted, (as it ought, being the undoubted Doctrine and Judgment of our Church, which we have subscribed) it evidently follows, that our good works, (consider them which way you will, with Merit, or without it) are not required to our justification. For 'tis certain, that good works, (consider them what way you will) are something else, and differing from Faith. 'Tis justification, from which our Church excludes works, not Sanctification; (which the Papists and you

b Heb. 12. 14.
without holi-
ness no man
shall see the
Lord, and
1 Tim. 4. 8.

i Eph. 2. 10.

& Heb. 10. 38.

i Rom. 10. 10.
πιστευουσιν
καὶ ὁ Θεὸς δι-
κασιμαίαν ποι-
ήσει αὐτοῖς
καὶ τὴν φωνὴν
τοῦ Κυρίου
ἀκούσουσιν
Occumenius in
locum vid etiam
Theocloretum.

you confound, with your *Justificatio prima* and *Secunda*) Hope and Charity, but Penitence and Sincere Obedience, are effects and fruits of Faith ^b necessary to our Sanctification and Salvation, (as ours, and all Reform'd Churches confess, and constantly prove) but not so to our justification. *Non sunt media precedentia ordinata ad Justitiam, sed ad gloriam.* They are (as St. Bernard truly said, *via regni, licet non causa regnandi.* Being made new Creatures, Created in Christ Jesus (and consequently Regenerated and justified) we are (saith the Apostle) Created unto good works, that we should walk in them. Now as we must have a Natural Life, before we can walk, and exercise the Acts and Operations of it, (for vital actions, necessarily pre-suppose Life, which is their cause and principal whence they flow) so we must have a Lively Faith, (which is our Spiritual Life) and consequently be justified, before we can expect any Spiritual actions, walk in the ways of God's Commandments, and do good works, which are the effects and fruits of that Spiritual Life. This distinction, is not mine, (or any School-mans) invention: The Apostle has it expressly in the Text. *The Heart believes unto Righteousness,* and with the Mouth confession

is made unto Salvation. Confession is a good work, an act of true Penitence, and a fruit of Faith; but Faith and confession do not concur to our Justification;

'tis *fides ad justitiam, confessio ad Salutem.*

And elsewhere; *responsum consuetudinis, &c.* m Phil. 2. 12.

Work out your Salvation; not your Justification. *Bona opera sunt via & media Gloriam, quam precedunt; non ita ad justitiam, quam sequuntur.*

9. Because you are so confident, that there is nothing in our Homilies against your Justification by works; I shall add a passage or two more, which (if impartially consider'd) may possibly alter your Judgment, or abate your confidence. This 1. passage is this, After we were in the Homily told; that nothing on our part was required to our justification, but a Lively Faith (of which before). It immediately follows,

Faith doth not shut out Repentance, Hope, Love, &c. To n Hom. pt. 1. P. 14, 15.

be joyned with Faith, in every Man, who is justified; but it shuts them out from the Office of justifying. So that though they be all present together in him who is justified, yet they justify not altogether. In which words, we are more particularly told two things concerning good works, and other vertues distinct from Faith, and how they are secluded from

from our justification. 1. In the Negative, they are not so shut out, as not to be present in every justified person. 2. In the Affirmative, they are shut out in respect of any Casualty or Concurrence with Faith to our justification. *Bonorum operum presentiam agnoscimus, non efficientiam; sunt fidei Comites individui, in omni justificato, sed non causa justificationis.*

Answer.

In answer to this you (very inconsiderately) say, 'That the Doctrine of justification by Faith, doth not only shut out other vertues, from the Office of justifying, but doth also shut out Faith it self from that Office. For (say you) the Homily expressly says, page 17. That justification is the Office of God only, and denies it to be the Office of Man, and that Faith justifies. And indeed, (so you go on) if Faith did justify, justification must be the Office of Man, as much as Faith is his Duty.'

Sol.

This Discourse is, (at least it seems to me) inconsequent, and inconsistent with it self and Truth. For 1. The Doctrine of justification by Faith (as explained in our Articles and Homilies) is, that Faith only justifies, so that *nothing else* is required *on our parts*. That it is *the only means and instrument* of our justification. That it is *ordained of God*, and appointed to this

o Art. Religio-
nis 11.

p Hom. pt. 1.
p. 14.

q Hom. pt. 2.
p. 187. 188.

very

very end : And that Faith *only* Receives, ^{r Hom. pt. 2.}
apprehends, and *lays hold* upon our Blessed ^{p. 82.}
 Saviours Merits, by which we are justifi- ^{Ibid p. 258.}
 fied : So that (by our Churches Doctrine) it
 is some way, the work and office of Faith
 only, (all other works being shut out) to
 justify us. Now you endeavour to prove,
 out of the same Homilies, (part. 1. p. 17.)
 that 'tis neither the office of works, nor
 Faith, nor any other vertue to justifie.
 That is, you endeavour to prove,
 that our Homilies contradict themselves,
 and what is affirmed in one (as true) must
 be denied (as false) in another, (the very
 next Homily. 2. And as you make the
 Homilies contradict one another ; so you
 contradict your self. For you say ; The
 Doctrine of justification by Faith, shuts
 out Faith from justification. That is,
 (in plain English) the Doctrine which is
 for justification *by Faith*, does *deny Faith*
to justify. 3. The proof you bring is as
 strange, as the position for which you
 bring it. The position is this, Not only
 other vertues, but Faith it self, is shut
 out from the Office of justification. This
 position you prove thus, justification (say
 you, and cite the Homily for it) is the
 Office of God only, not a Man. *ergo*. It is
 neither the office of any other vertue, nor
 of Faith it self to justify. (You might,
 and High Priest by the sacrifice
 and

and had you dealt impartially, ought to have added (what the Homily has in the place you cite) that works, as well as Faith, are shut out from the office of justification, and then you had confuted your own Hypothesis, (of justification by works) as much as mine, of justification by Faith). But to proceed in Answer to your argument, pray Sir consider, and consult your Logick, and I am perswaded, that (upon Second Thoughts) you may see and ought to acknowledge, the miserable inconsequence of such Reasoning. For had there been only one way of justifying a sinner, and one onely office for dispensing it, and that the office of God only: Then your argument might have had (which now has none at all) some better consequence. But now 'tis certain, and (both in our Homilies and Scripture) evident, that there are several ways of justification, and several Offices, and Officers for dispensing it. For,

1. There is one way of justifying, *per modum Judicis, peccatorum pro Tribunali, aculpa & pena absolvendis*: And this is the office of our Great and Gracious God only; and of this the Homily you cite speaks.
2. There is another way of justifying a Sinner, to wit, by way of Merit and Satisfaction for Sins. So our blessed Saviour, and High-Priest, by the Sacrifice of

of himself, and his Meritorious Passion, did purchase pardon of our Sins, and justification: *Peccati veniam & justitiam moriendo impetrat.* So that he became our Righteousness, and his Righteousness ours. (as shall anon fully appear) And this is only his office, in order to our justification.

3. There is another way of justification, by applying and relying upon those Merits and Satisfaction of our blessed Saviour, whereby his Righteousness become ours, and we (by it) are *coram Deo*, justified, and this is the office of Faith only, or the office of Man by Faith.

† Hom. pt. 1.
p. 17. lin. 26.

The promises consider'd, I hope you will (or may) see the inconsistency and inconsequence of your Reasoning in this particular. For although it be the office of God only, to justify *per modum Judicis*, and as the principal efficient cause of our justification: Yet, as this hinders not, but our blessed Saviours satisfaction may (and certainly does) justify, as the only Meritorious cause of our justification: So it hinders not, but Faith may (and certainly does) justify (though an other way) as the hand and instrument of the Soul, which apprehends and applies our blessed Saviours Merits and Satisfaction, whereby they become ours, and we justified by them. 4. And that it is the office of

Hom. of Sal-
vation Pt. 1.
p. 14, 15.

of Faith, thus to justify; had you (as you ought) consider'd, you might have Learn'd out of those very words you cite, and pretend to answer. Where the Authors of our Homily, having said, that *Faith only* and *nothing else*, was required on man's part to justification. It follows there, That Faith did not shut out Repentance, Hope, Love, &c. from being joyned with it, in every Man who is justified; but it shuts them out *from the office of justifying*. The meaning of which words is undeniably this, it shuts them out from doing the *office* which *Faith alone* did; that is, from the office of justifying. So that (in the judgment of our Church declared in our Homilies) Faith did justify, that was its Office, but it was not the office of any other works or virtues. 5. And this is further evident, by what follows a little after in the same Homily. Where the reason is given, why (in Scripture) Faith is said to justify without works, and what its office is in justifying, which belongs to no other works or virtues: And the Reason is, in these words, *because Faith doth directly send us to Christ, for Remission of Sins, and by it, we do embrace the promises of Mercy and Remission of Sins, which thing no other virtues or works pro-*

Hom. of Sal-
vation, 3 Pt.
p. 18.

perly

perly do. So that the Office of Faith in justifying, is to send us directly to our blessed Saviour, for Remission of Sins, and imbracing the promises; and these things (saith the Homily) *no other vertues or works doing*, they are all shut out from (what Faith only performs) the office of justifying. *Q. E. D.* 6. Lastly, (that I may give you further information and satisfaction, in this Article of Justification by Faith) It is to be consider'd, that Faith, Hope, Love, Fear, &c. are (in Scripture, as in other good Authors) usually put for their objects. So God is called *our hope*, and Christ *our hope*. *2 God* Jer. 17. 4.
is Love. The Fear of Isaac; that is the *13. 14. 17.*
object of Hope, Love, and Fear. *1 Tim. 1. 7.* If I *1 Joh. 4. 8.*
have made Gold my hope (saith a Job) that *Job 31. 24.*
is, the object of my hope. So that Famous saying of Ignatius (mention'd by Eusebius) *ὁ ἰσὺς ἑμεῖς ἐσθλαίμα*, my Love, that is, Christ, whom I Love, is Crucified. So St. Paul is said to *Preach the Faith*, *Gal. 1. 23.*
that is, Christ, and the Gospel, the objects of Faith. And hence is that common distinction amongst the School-men and Divines, *Fides qua credimus*, and *fides quam credimus*, or the object of our Faith. So that when St. Paul speaks of our Justification *coram Deo*, and says, That Faith *Rom. 4. 5.*
is accounted for Righteousness: And that

E

Righ

d Rom. 4. 6. d Righteousness imputed by God. By Faith here, its object Christ Jesus, his sufferings and satisfaction is, and must be meant.
e 1 Cor. 1. 30. e For he is our Righteousness, *e* which God imputes and makes ours. For we are justified, *coram Deo*, only through the
f Rom. 3. 24. f Redemption which is *in Christo*, in or by Jesus Christ, or by his Blood. So the
g Rom. 5. 9. g Apostle says, *g* That we are justified by his Blood. So that it is our blessed Saviours Blood, and the Redemption and Pardon of our Sins purchased by it, which justifies us *coram Deo*. But this Blood and Redemption of our blessed Saviour must be applied and made ours by Faith only; and *ergo*, the same Apostle says expressly, That we are justified *through Faith in his blood; Christus Remissionem peccati & Justitiam morte impetrat, fides sola applicat.* Now, although man (by the hand of Faith) receive Christ and his Righteousness, yet he can be no more said to Justifie himself *coram Deo*; than a Beggar can be said to in-rich himself, who receives a 1000 *l.* freely given him by his Benefactor. For as it is not the Beggars hand (which receives) but the Money received, which is riches; so it is not the hand of Faith which receives Christ's Righteousness, but the Righteousness received, which justifies us *coram Deo*:

Deo ! And this the rather, because the Beggar had (by nature) a hand to receive his Benefactors Benevolence, but our most gracious God gives both his Son, (who is our Righteousness) and he gives us Faith too, which is the hand to receive it. And when you say, (to prove that Faith does not justify ; though you had before expressly said, that (at first) Faith only justified us) ^m that if Faith did justify, then justification must be the office of man, as much as Faith is his Duty. Now here, 1. If this Reasoning of yours were true, and effectually prove, that Faith does not justify ; then (in contradiction to your own Hypothesis) you may prove (by the same Reason) that works do not justify, thus, If works justify, then must Justification be the office of Man, as much as works are his Duty. 'Tis manifest, that works are our Duty, as well as Faith, and if not Duty of Man do justify him, (least he should be said to justify himself) then certainly works do not. But too much of this, which deserves no answer ; but is so loose and inconsistent, that I cannot think, that you were really awake when you writ it.

10. You have said (though you had little Reason to say it) that you had shew'd,

E 2

that

Joh. 3. 26.
1 Cor. 1. 30.
Eph. 2. 8.

^m Your Letter
p. 1.
ⁿ Letter p. 2.

o Your Letter
p. 2.

o that the assertion of Justification by Christian works, was not contrary to Scripture, or the Church of *England*: You go on, (with your usual confidence) to urge an argument for Justification by works, from *St. Paul*, who (you say) is thought to be (and indeed is) its greatest Antagonist. Your Argument is thus,

Objection.

p 2 Theff. 7. 11.
and 1 Theff.
1. 3.
These Texts
you cite.

' We are justified by Faith, and the
' repeated acts of it, *ergo.* by works. For
' *St. Paul* twice calls, *Faith the work of*
' *Faith*. And you add, ' That *St. Paul*
' frequently asserts, that to be justified by
' Faith, is no more, then to be justified,
' by the *continued acts of the habit of Faith*,
' and *ergo.* by works. And then you add,
' One would think, that such an Argu-
' ment were *unanswerable*.

Answer.

Sir, I shall (for your sake) that I may
(so far as I am able) undeceive you, and
rectifie your great mistakes, give an Answer
to this argument, which you (with
great confidence, and no less Temerity)
mis-cal *unanswerable*. And here, 1. When you
say, ' one would think it were *unanswer-*
' *able*. If by *one*, you mean your self, 'tis
granted. Possibly you may think so,
but (beside your self) I believe no con-
sidering Person, (who understands Lo-
gick and Divinity) either would, or (with-
out

out great vanity) could think so. 2. I should wonder, that you should bring such confident and inconsistent mistakes for Reasons, had you not used me to it, and (in your whole Epistle) brought no better. 3. You manifestly mistake the Business you are (or should be) about, and the Conclusion you should prove, for that which (by your *unanswerable* argument) you endeavour to prove, is that we are justified by the acts, or works of Faith, which no Body denies; no not *Papists*, who attribute their *Justificatio prima*, solely to the acts, or habit of Faith. Whereas you should have proved, (otherwise your proofs would be impertinent) that the works of Charity, Penitence, Temperance, and all other virtues concur with Faith, and (as you ^q say) equally with it, to our justification. But this your unanswerable argument, neither does, nor can pretend to prove. 4. You say, that St. Paul does *twice* call Faith the *work of Faith*, (in the places above cited) surely you never Read, or consider'd not, those places in St. Paul, which you cite. St. Paul does indeed speak of *by or without*, the work of Faith. But that Faith should be the *work of Faith*, (as you say) that the same thing should produce it self; be its own cause and effect,

^q You say, you agree with the Socinians, in asserting the conditionality of works, as well as Faith to Justification. (In your Letter page 1.) So that Socinus, and you, are agreed in this, though in contradiction to Truth, and the subscribed Doctrine of our Church.

and so before and after it self. This is such a piece of non-sense and contradiction, as St. Paul could not, nor any considering person would be guilty of. 5. You say, 'That St. Paul frequently asserts, 'that to be justified by Faith, is no more, 'then to be justified by the continued acts 'of the habit of Faith. Strange Confidence! For, 1. This proposition, is so far from being frequently asserted by St. Paul, that it never occurs, not once, in any of his 14 Epistles. If you think otherwise, (as it seems you do) make it appear, and you shall have my Thanks and Submission. 2. We Read indeed of Aristotle, his Scholiasts, and the School-men of *ἔξω, ἡβίτις*, or the Habits of all vertues: But that St. Paul should speak of the Habit of your Faith, is your mistake. *ἡ πίστις, ἡ ἀγάπη, and ἡ εὐχάριστις*, occur in St. Paul, when he speaks of Faith and other Evangelical Graces; but Habits he never calls them. 3. That we are justified by Faith, we find in St. Paul frequently: But that we are justified by the repeated and continued acts of it, is not once found in him, much less (as you say) frequently, 4. Besides, when you say, (and tell us, St. Paul said so too) 'That we are justified 'by the continued acts of the habit of Faith. You make Justification, the effect of the act

acts only, not of the Habit of Faith. Whereas it is evident, that the habit alone, many times justifies, when the act is absent. For a man may be (and many times is) Just, Charitable, or Temperate by the habits only, when he exerciseth no act of Justice, Charity or Temperance: So a Man (by the habit or grace of Faith) may be a Faithful, and a Justified person, when he does not in *acta exercito*, and actually believe. Otherwise we should put off our Justice with our Cloaths; and cease to be just, when we begin to sleep. For (I suppose) men do not exercise and elicit acts of Faith (more then of other vertues) when they are fast asleep. 5. And if it be true, (and you say, St. Paul frequently says it) that we are justified by the *repeated and continued acts of Faith*. I desire you would inform me, what need of any other works, (which you say, justify as well as Faith) to our Justification, if the *repeated and continued acts of Faith* alone will do it?

II. Next, you bring an answer to your own argument, which (you say) you have often heard and read, and 'tis this, 'That we are justified by Faith, not as 'it is a work, but as it is an instrument 'receiving Christs Righteousness. But 'this (you say) is groundless; for there

II.

p. 2. of your Letter.

' is no such phrase in Scripture, or our Church Books. To this I say, 1. That you might have done well, to have told us, where, and in whom you read that answer, that so I might have seen and consider'd it. 2. Admit (which is evidently untrue) that there were no such phrase in Scripture, or our Church Books; yet if the thing it self signified by that phrase there, the answer will not (as you pretend) be groundless; but would have a sufficient foundation, on which we might build our Faith, and belief of it. For Trinity of Persons, Unity of Essence, that the Holy Ghost is *ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενος* (and such like phrases) occur not (*κατὰ τὸ πῶς*) in Scripture, and yet (I suppose) you will not (I am sure you should not) say, *f* that the belief of them is groundless; because (in *Athanasius* his Creed) you have subscribed the Truth and belief of them. 3. You believe the Conditionality of good works, or that good works are a condition of our Justification; yet, you neither do, nor can shew such phrases in Scripture, or any of our Homilies, or Church Books. 4. When you say, that this phrase, (Faith is an instrument of receiving Righteousness) is in no Church Book, I have before shew'd

f In your Subscription of our Articles, Art. 8. of the 3 Creeds.

shew'd you your Error, as to this particular : That very phrase, being *in* ^{t Hom. pt. 2, p. 187, 188,} *terminis*, and expressly twice in one Homily. 5. And though it be not in Scripture in express words, yet the thing signified by those words, is really, (and by good consequence) deducible from Scripture. St. *John* ^{u Joh. 1, 12.} tells us ; that by Faith we receive Christ, so as thereby we become the Sons of God. Now the Soul is the principal, and the act of Faith, (an accident of the Soul) the Instrumental cause, by which we receive Christ, and his Righteousness. As there are corporal Instruments, (as a Sword, a Knife, a Hatchet, &c.) so all (who are acquainted with *Aristotle* and his *Scholasts*.) know, that there are τῆς ψυχῆς ὀργανα, Intellectual Instruments, which the Soul useth. So Logick is an intellectual instrument *ab Anima, in scientiis tradentis & docendis adhibitum*. 6. The answer you mention, [That Faith justifies not as a work, but as an instrument receiving Christ's Righteousness.] I neither know, nor do you tell me, whose it is : Sure I am, 'tis none of mine, nor (as you barely propose it) any bodies else I have yet met with ; and therefore I am not bound to defend it. I shall therefore willingly grant. 1. That

to believe, is *sub precepto*. It is the Com-
 * Joh. 3. 23. mandment * of our most Gracious God,
 that we should believe. 2. That to be-
 lieve, to apprehend, apply and rely upon
 the Merits and Satisfaction of our Blessed
 Saviour, for Remission of Sins : These
 (I say) are good works, and instruments
 of our Soul, in our Justification. This
 I do, and did before grant ; and when
 you hence infer, ' That we are justified
 ' by works : This (like the rest of your
 Discourse) is *in se ipso et de ipso*, imperti-
 nent, nothing for your purpose, or a-
 gainst us, who deny Justification by
 works, so as I have before shew'd you,
 and the reason of it. In short, Faith as
 an act, a work or instrument (call it
 what you will) is that *by which* the Merits
 of our Blessed Saviour (for which alone
 we are justified) are applied and made
 ours. But Faith, neither as an act, work
 or instrument, is (or can be) that *for*
which, we are justified *coram Deo* : This
 which I say, (if you will consult and con-
 sider it) is the very meaning and words
 * Article, 11. of our * Article, we are accounted Righ-
 teous before God, *only for the Merits of*
Christ, and *only by Faith*. *Solus Christus*
per mortis meritum Justitiam impetrat,
Sola fides applicat. Other works have no
 hand in the impetration or application of
 our

our Blessed Saviours Merits, and therefore, neither have they any hand in our Justification. *Q. E. D.*

12. I come now to the place in St. *James*, (which you urge, often and much, ^{12.} Your Letter, to little purpose, as you shall see anon) of ^{Page, 3.} which you say, 'That St. *James* his Justification by works, is God's pardoning a Man, and continuing him in the state of pardon, upon the doing of Godly works, that spring from Faith. And you add, 'That you are too weak sighted, to perceive any harm in this Doctrine.

In answer to this, I do (and desire you ^{Answer.} to) consider, 1. That (with your usual confidence) you give us a position without any proof at all; And therefore (till it be proved) a denial is a sufficient answer. 2. You say, 'That upon doing Godly works, which spring from Faith, our Sins are pardoned, and we continued in the state of Pardon. Now by this Doctrine and position, 1. You expressly contradict Truth and the Doctrine of our Church, in the ² Articles, which you ² Article 12. have subscribed, which says, That good works which are the fruits of Faith, follow after Justification, and so our Sins are pardon'd before we do, (or can do) any good works. So that to say, (as you do) that our Sins are pardon'd upon the doing

doing of good works; is (in plain English) to say, that good works do that, which is (*de facto*, and) actually done already.

*a Sola Christi
merita, fide
vivā anima ap-
plicata, peccati
veniam impe-
trant, vide,
Acts 10. 43. &
13. 38, 39. &
15. 9. Rom.
3. 25. And
Cajetan (tho'
a Papist) tells
us, Justitia
Dei per fidem,
Rom 3. 22.
apertca signifiet
ad per Justiti-
am Operum
nullo Justifica-
tur, Justitia
remittente, pec-
cata, sed. Sola
Justitia Dei
per fidem Ca-
jetan; in Rom.
3. p. (mihi)
18. 19.*

2. Our Article says expressly, that good works cannot *a put away Sin, ergo*. We are not justified, nor our Sins pardoned by doing them. For that must of necessity, put away our Sins, by which we are justifi'd, and our Sins pardoned, (seeing putting away, and pardoning our Sins, signify the same thing) and if our Sins cannot be put away, by our good works, then they cannot be pardon'd, and we justified by such works, (as you confidently affirm) so that the case between you and your Mother (the Church of England) stands thus, she expressly says, That our good works cannot put away Sin: You say, They can put away Sin, procure pardon, and justify us. Thus you impugne the Doctrine of our Church, (and own it under your hand) which by (the Canon) deserves Excommunication *ipso facto*; and (by the Statute) Deprivation. Now as you have (with little Truth or Modesty) admonished me, to retract my Errors; so I think I may (with more Truth and Authority) admonish you, (and hereby I do admonish you) to retract yours; and it will concern you (more, may be, than you are aware of)

quib

to

to remember it. But to let this pass.

3. You, your self confirm what I have said, (though you contradict your self)

That we are justified, and our Sins pardon'd, before those Godly works which spring from Faith : When you say, ^b

'That we are (at first) brought into a state of *Justification by Faith only*. (and

you cite the ^c Homily for it) For if this be true (and you say it is) that we are

(at first justified by Faith *only*, then it evidently follows, that we have pardon

of Sins too (at first) *only by Faith*. For you say, ^d 'That Justification consists

'only in Remission of Sins; and then 'tis manifest, that Faith only justifying, it

only procures Remission : And yet you tell us, (in the same page) That Godly

works which spring from Faith, do also put us in a state of pardon. That is (in

plain English) the works which spring from Faith, put us in a condition and

state, in which we were actually put, (before those works had any being) and

that by Faith only. 4. You say, (pa. 1.) 'That Faith and ^e works do continue us,

'in the state of Justification and pardon : And yet (page, 3.) You say, 'That

'works, which spring from Faith, do both put us in a state of pardon, and continue

'us in it too. In the former place, you say,

^b In Your Letter p. 1.

^c Homily of Justification (of Salvation, you mean, for that is the Title of it) pt. 2. p. 16.

^d Near the end of your Letter p. 3.

^e But tho' you join faith and works, as concurring to our Justification, yet a more learned and Judicious Divine then your self, (which I think your modesty will not deny) tells us, that this is impossible, Fidem & opera ad Justificationem concurrere, impossibile est. Jac. Arminius Disputat. Privata 48. operum page 401.

say, 'Faith alone, puts us in a state of
 'Justification and pardon; and then Faith
 'and works together, continue us in it.
 In the latter place you say, 'That works
 'which spring from Faith, do both put
 'us in a state of pardon, and continue us
 'in it. Sir, these things seem (to me)
 very inconsiderately said by you; seeing
 in them, you manifestly contradict Truth,
 and your self. 5. When you say, 'That
 'we are (at first) justified by Faith only,
 'and afterwards by works; you admit
 and approve that *Popish* distinction, of
Justificatio prima & secunda: So confound-
 ing of Justification and Sanctification,
 contrary to Truth, and the Judgment
 of our own, and all Reform'd Churches.
 6. When you grant, that (at first) we
 are justified by Faith only; this is a Truth
 so evident in Scripture, that even *Popish*
 Writers, (though zealous for Justification
 by works, as you are) neither do nor
 dare deny it, The *Trent* Fathers say,

f Concilium Tri-
 S. H. 6. De
 Justif. cap. 8.

*Fides est initium, radix, & Fundamen-
 tum omnis justitia.* And that so univer-
 sally of all, that it preceeds penitence:
 which (as it includes *penitentia* and *emenda-*
 a change of Judgment, with an aversion
 from all evil, and conversion to all good)
 contains all good works, which are the
 effects and fruits of Faith. So the *Trent*

Cate.

Catechisme, & In eo quem penitet, fides ^{g Catechisma,}
penitentiam antecedit necesse est, nec enim ^{Trident. Part.}
potest quisquam, se ad Deam convertore, ^{2. Cap. 8, 9.}
 qui fide caret. And to this purpose,

Vasquez, b Fatentur omnes Catholici, b Vasquez in
fidem esse fundamentum edificiiis Spiritualis, ^{1. 2. Disp. 220.}
est radicem salutis nostrae, unde amor, spes, ^{cap. 7. Sect.}
 44, 47.

penitentia Pullulant. 7. And as it is
 (on all sides) confess'd, that (at first)
 Faith only justifies; so it continues our
 Justification. By Faith we stand, (or
 continue justified) says ⁱ the Apostle. ^{i Rom. 11. 20.}

And elsewhere, ^k We are kept by the ^{k i Pet. 1. 5.}
 power of God *through Faith* unto Salva-
 tion. It is the ^l Shield, by which we
 quench all the fiery Darts of the Devil, and
 overcome the World; nor is it only vic-
 torious, but (^{i rich}) ^m victory it self. ^{m i Joh. 5. 4. 5.}

Now, that which makes us stand in a
 justified Estate, that by which we are
 kept unto Salvation, and by which we
 are victorious and conquerors over the
 World and Sin, and Satan; That (I say)
continues our Righteousness (for if that
 be not continued, 'tis impossible we
 should stand, be kept unto Salvation, or
 conquer) but this Faith only does, and
 not works. *ergo.* 'Tis Faith which *con-*
tinues our Justification. 8. By Faith ^{n Joh. 1. 12.}

ⁿ we are Regenerate and become the ^{Gal. 3. 26.}
 Sons of God; it is our ^{o Gal. 2. 20.} Spiritual Life, ^{Heb. 10. 38.}
 and

p Joh. 17. 3. and that Life *p* is Eternal, so that we
 q Joh. 3. 16. *q* cannot perish. Whence we may evi-
 and Joh 11. 26 dently conclude, That which continues
 us in an Estate, in which we cannot pe-
 rish, continues our Justification, (for if
 that be not continued, we certainly perish)
 but 'tis Faith which so continues us. *ergo*.
 And further, 9. As it is certain (and
 confess'd) that the Merits and Satisfaction
 of our blessed Saviour, apprehended and
 applied by a lively Faith, is that only, which
 (at first) does, *r* or can justify us, *coram*
Deo, from all Sins past; so it is a certain,
 that such satisfaction so applied, will
 justify us, from all succeeding and future
 Sins, as they come. For if such satisfac-
 tion so applied, was a Plaister sufficient,
 to Cure all the Wounds of our Soul, and
 take away all our past Sins, and that at
 once and altogether (without the concur-
 rence of works) then certainly, the same
 satisfaction applied by the same Faith,
 will be sufficient, (and the only means)
 to take away single Sins, as (*pro futuro*)
 they * come to be committed. And then
 we shall, not only (at first) owe our
 Justification, but the continuation of it
 also, to Faith apprehending and apply-
 ing our Blessed Saviours Merits and Justi-
 fication. 10. And this may further ap-
 pear, by the Collation and Analogy be-
 viour

r Art Relig.
 11.

* This is assert-
 ed and proved,
 in our Homilies
 pt. 2. p. 262,
 263.

tween the *Brazen Serpent* erected by *Moses* in the Wilderness, and our Blessed Saviour Crucified, (the Type and the Antitype) thus set down by *St. John* (as explained by our blessed Saviour) [†] *As* [†] *Joh. 3. 14,* *Moses lifted up the Serpent in the Wilder-* ^{15, 16.} *ness, even so must the Son of Man be lift-* ^{See our Hom. pt. 2. p. 188.} *ed up; that whosoever believes in him, should* ^{in the 2. Ser. of the Passion.} *not perish, but have eternal Life.* Where I observe, 1. That, as they whose bodies were bit by the fiery Serpents, were cured of their bodily diseases, to a Temporal Life, by looking on that Serpent with their corporal Eyes: So they whose Souls are bit, by the Old Serpent (the Devil) are cured of their Spiritual wounds, to Eternal Life, by looking on our Blessed Saviour Crucified, with the Spiritual Eye of Faith, or (as the Text explains it) by believing on him.

2. And as their looking on the Brazen Serpent, (if they were bit 20 times, cured them, (nor was there any other way, appointed by God, to do it) so as by that means, not only the first, but the Second, Third and Twentieth biting, was perfectly cured. So by looking on our blessed Saviour Crucified, with the Eye of Faith, not only the first biting, or Sin of our Souls, but all our Sins successively (be they never so many) may be cured (that is pardon'd) by that means;

F

nor

" So our Homilies express it, pt. 2. page 186, 187, 188, 258, 259.

" The Homily for Good-Friday, part. 2. page, 177.

nor is there any other name or means under Heaven given, by which we can be cur'd, or saved from our Sins, and so justified. He is the only propitiation for our Sins, nor can that propitiation be made ours, so as to have the benefit of it, by any " other means, then by apprehending and applying it, by a Lively and Fruitful Faith. 11. And further, this is the express Doctrine of our Church, in her Homily : Where speaking of the Passion and Satisfaction of our blessed Saviour applied by Faith ; it follows, "*In this standeth the continual Pardon of our daily offences; in this resteth our Justification, in this we be allow'd, &c. The continual Pardon of our daily offences, (and therefore of our Justification) Standing, Resting, (or Depending) upon the Merits and Satisfaction of our Blessed Saviour, applied and made ours, by Faith, (the only means of such application) it evidently follows; that Faith is not only the means of our Justification, at first, (which you grant) but also, of our Continuation in it. Seeing the same Faith, which procured pardon at first, procures also continual pardon, of all offences which follow. 12. And (as to the affirmative part of the position) by the premises, it seems evident, that Faith only*

only (at first) justifies a Sinner, and afterwards, continues his Justification: So (for the Negative part) it may as manifestly appear, that our works do not continue us, (as you pretend) in the state of Justification, into which Faith (at first) puts us. For,

1. That which continues us in the state of Justification, must have a continued being it self, without interruption. For 'tis impossible, that any thing should give continuance to another, when it continues not in being (but actually ceaseth to be) it self: *Operari presupponit esse*, and therefore, that which has no being, cannot possibly give or continue being to any other thing. Now, 'tis certain, that our good works are transient, and too often interrupted. So that many times, we have none at all, actually to continue our Justification. And this interruption, and want of good works, is sometimes, by the intervention of our Sins: for in

many things we offend all, (says St. James 3. 2)

And our Homily says, That we Sin daily and hourly. Now when we fall into

x James 3. 2.

Homilies pt.

2 page 256.

The words these,

We do daily

and Hourly, by our wickedness, and stubborn disobedience horribly fall away from God, &c. They are the words of your Mother, the Church of England; and had you read and consider'd, 1. The sad confessions of their Sins, made by the Prophets, and most Pious Men in Scripture, as by David many times in his Psalms: By Isaias, cap. 64. 6; 7. By Jeremiah, in his Lamentations; by Daniel, cap. 9. &c. Or 2. Had you consider'd

the Confessions of your Church, in her ancient Liturgies, (Greek or Latin) particularly, in that Missa Latina Antiqua, published first by Eist. Illyricus, and then by Carotinal-Bona, which was in use in the Roman Church, a 1000 Years ago, or the Confession in our own Liturgy; In all which, Confessions of many multiplied Sins are made by that Church; Non tantum humiliter, (as the Pelagians) sed recacitur, (as the Catholick Fathers said) I say, had you consider'd and believ'd these things, you could not so confidently have affirm'd our Justification, or the Continuation of it, by our own works; with themselves were discontinued, by the continual intervention of our many and great Sins. Sir, Whatever opinion we may have (at present) of Justification by our good works, and our continuation of that Justice by them; yet when we shall appear, (as one day we must) at the dreadful Tribunal of our just God; we shall (I believe) be of Bellarmines opinion, (who had been earnest for Justification by works) and say (as upon more serious and second thoughts) he did, Propter presentis vitæ incertitudinem, Tutissimum est, in Solo Christo recumbere, &c.

those Sins, and are in the actual commission of them; I desire to know of you, what good works we have to continue our Justification. St. Peter's Faith (and so his Justification) fail'd not, but continued; (for our blessed Saviour promis'd, and pray'd that it should not fail) even then, when he denied and forswore his Master, yet surely he then had no good works actually to continue it. When just Men, are actually and innocently fast a-sleep in the night, (which is for a considerable part of their Life) they neither have (nor are obliged to have) any good works; and yet (I suppose) you will grant, that even then, (when they have no good works) their Justification is continued; unless you will say, that they put off their Justice with their Cloaths, which

because

because you should think not, I suppose, you will not say.

2. When a Sinner is (at first) justified by Faith only, nothing can concur to the continuation of that Justification, which does not concur to the continuance of a Lively Faith; which (on our part) was the only means by which it became ours, so that we had a Right and Title to it. For without such Faith, 'tis impossible such Justice should be continued, and with it, 'tis impossible not to be continued. Now good works neither do nor can concur to the continuance of our Faith, so that it should (by them) be continued. For all our good works are the Fruits and effects of Faith, and therefore cannot possibly concur to the being, or continuation of their cause. As it is not rational to say, that good fruits concur to the being or continuance of the Tree that bares them; so their will be as little reason to say, that good works (which are the fruits of Faith) concur to the being or continuance, of the principle and cause from whence they come.

3. It is certain (as has been said) that a Lively Faith gives being to our good works, (as the cause and root from whence they spring) and continuance too; for according to the strength or weakness of

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

our Faith, our good works are, with more or less constancy continued. And therefore (*vice versa*) to say, that good works give being or continuance to Faith, (or Justification, which inseparably follows it) is indeed to assert contradictions and impossibilities.

13. But to come nearer to that place (in *St. James*) which you so often urge (and mistake) for a proof of your position, though you do not so much as endeavour to shew us, how (by any deduction, or just consequence) that justification by works which you assert, may (from that place in *St. James*) be concluded. And though a bare denial, of what you barely say, (without any pretence of proof) were a sufficient answer. Yet because I see you (and some others) stand much upon that place, and press it for other purposes, then were ever intended by the Apostle, I shall (God willing) distinctly shew you the Apostles meaning, and the reasons why I think it is so, and that there is no opposition, (much less any contradiction) but a perfect Harmony and Consent between *St. Paul* and *St. James*. And here,

1. I believe it is a certain Truth, (which many more Learned Men affirm) that *St. Paul* and *St. James*, (in what they have

have writ of Justification) have different ends and purposes. *Quod Sola fides Justificat, Paulus, quæ & qualis sit illa fides, ostendit Jacobus.* St. Paul's design is, to prove (all works excluded) that Faith only justifies : St. James tells us, what Faith that is, (for 'tis not every kind of Faith will do that great work) and in order to this,

2. St. James says, and evidently proves, (against the seeming and hypocritical Christians, who thought Faith would save them, though they lived impious Lives) that a Dead, Barren and Fruitless Faith could not Justify or Save them : And this he fully does, in 7 verses ; from the 14th (inclusive) to the 21th (exclusive) and then concludes that Chapter, and his whole discourse, with a Conclusion consonant to his premises, That, ^{22 Jam. 2. 26.} *As the Body without the Spirit, (or Breath, as in the Margent of our Bibles it is truly explained) is Dead, so Faith without works is dead also, and cannot justify.* This for the Negative part, that a *dead Faith does not justify.* St. James expressly proves.

3. And for the Affirmative, that it must be an operative, a working and fruitful Faith which justifies, he proves in the 5 following verses (21, 22, 23, 24, 25.)

by two instances; that of *Abraham*, and the other of *Rahab*, whose Faith (by which they were justified, as appears by Scripture) was not *Dead and Barren*, but *fruitful of good works*. This is evidently the aim and end of *St. James* his whole discourse, to shew (against the seeming Christians) that a *barren Faith* did not, and a *fruitful faith* did justify.

Objection.

But does not *St. James* expressly say; That *Abraham and Rahab* were justified by works. And verse 24. That a man is justified by works, and not by faith only.

Answer.

Yes, These are his words, but the Question is, *What is the true sense and meaning of them?* and how they are to be reconciled with *St. Paul*, who as expressly
 a Rom. 3. 28. says, That we are justified by faith, without the works of the Law. I know that (*Racovia* and *Rome*) *Socinian* and *Popish* Writers, usually object these words to *Protestant* Divines; the one, to prove Justification by universal sincere obedience, (as they call it) the other, by our own inherent Righteousness. (as their phrase is) Both are for Justification by works, (and that, *coram Deo*) though in a different manner, and upon divers grounds. But, sure I am, that no Reformed Church in *Christendom*, nor any Learned Divine of our own Church,

(I have yet met with, and you cite none) before the Year 1640. ever admitted that sense of St. *James* his words, which *Popish* or *Socinian* Writers put upon them, or conceived them, to be any proof of Justification *coram Deo*, by our own works and inherent Righteousness. And here, that I may give you the true meaning of this passage in St. *James*, according to the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, Antiquity, and the Reform'd Churches, (as may appear by their publick Confessions, and best Writers) I do (and desire you to) consider,

1. That a man may be said to be justified two ways (and both occur in Scripture) 1. *Coram Deo*: So that justifies, which constitutes a man just before God, and at his Tribunal. So our Church (in her *b* Article) says, That we are justified *b* Article 11. before God, by the Merits of Christ only, applied by Faith only. And this is that way of Justification, St. *Paul* constantly speaks of, (in opposition to works) *Justificatio* ^c *ἐν ἡμῶν αὐτῶν*, or *d* *κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ* or *e* ^c Rom. 3. 20. ^d Gal. 3. 11. ^e Eph. 1. 4. *κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐτῶν*. &c. 2. *Coram Hominibus*; so that Justifies, which is an Evidence of our antecedent Justification, and declares a person already just before God. Thus we say, good works justify; and this is the Justification which St. *James* attributes to

to good works. And that this may not be only *pretario & gratis dictum*; I say further, 1. That this may be. 2. That it must be, St. James his meaning in this place.

2 That it may be his meaning, I think manifest: Because the words and expressions used by St. James, may, (in their Genuine, and (in Scripture) usual signification) have that sense and meaning: Nor is there any ground in the nature of the things signified, or circumstances of the Text, to convince us, that they must have any other meaning. For 1. The words in St. James (which have occasion'd different Interpretations of his meaning) are these, *ἡ ἐργασία*, *Abraham* was justified by works, and *Rahab* was justified by works. Now that the word *δικαιοσύνη*, (which the Apostle here uses) does usually signify (not to make or constitute one just, but) to declare an antecedent Justice, is evident in Scripture, where
 f Matt. 11. 19. such expressions as these usually occur, *ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἡ τοῦ πατρὸς*, Wisdom is justified.
 g 1 Tim. 3. 16. *ὁ Θεὸς ἐδικαιοῖται*, God is justified in the Spirit.
 h Luke 7. 29. *ἐδικαιοῦνται τὸν Θεόν*, The *Publicans* justified God. In all which, (and many more such places) 'tis evident, that to justify, is not to constitute, but only to declare Just. For although men may declare the
 Justice

Justice of God, yet certainly 'tis impossible they should constitute, and make him Just, who was infinitely Just, before Man had being, and would have continued so, if we had never been. And other words of like composition, have (in Scripture) the like signification. So to magnifie God, to glorifie his Name, &c. signifie only to declare, and not to constitute or make God Great and Glorious. 2. Seeing then the word in Scripture, usually has these two significations, (to constitute and declare just; and St. James speaks only in general; that *Abraham* was justified by works, without any limitation of the words, to either meaning in particular: Therefore, I say, that the word in him *may be* taken, in the declarative signification; unless (by the Nature of the thing, or circumstances of the Text, it appear, that it must be taken otherwise. But this is so far from appearing, that I say, 3. That the nature of the thing, and the circumstances of the Text (and persons mention'd in it) consider'd; it does (to me) manifestly appear; that to justify, (in St. James) not only *may*, but *must* be taken in the declarative signification we have spoken of. For,

1. It

1. It is certain, (and by you confess'd) that (at first) Faith only justifies: That it is, the ⁱ Spiritual Life, by which the just man lives: That from this Root, all our good works spring, and are effects and fruits of it, which (as our Church & tells us) do necessarily (though otherwise the actions are free and voluntary) follow, and flow from it. Now, as in natural things, good fruits neither do, nor can constitute a true good; but must (of necessity) pre-suppose it to be so, before it can bare good fruit: So in Spiritual things; good and just works (which are fruits of Faith) cannot constitute or make, but must necessarily pre-suppose him just who does them. Good works, or works of Righteousness, (as St. John, ^l Titus ^m 3. 5. and St. Paul ^m calls them) are operations of Spiritual Life, and necessarily presuppose that Life, as the cause and principle from whence they only can come. Every one, (says St. John) *that doth Righteousness (or works of Righteousness, or Righteous and good works) is born of God.* Righteous Operations (if St. John say truth) pre-suppose a new Birth, our Regeneration, and consequently our Justification. (It being impossible, that any Regenerate man should be still in his Sins, impenitent and unjustified) And ergo, they cannot possibly justify

ⁱ Heb. 10. 38.

Gal. 3. v. 20.

^k Articulo

Relig. vid.

ⁱ Joh. 3. 5.

^l Joh. 2. 29.

^m Titus 3. 5.

justify (or truly be said to justify) us so, as to constitute and make us just, *coram Deo*. It is a certain and manifest Truth in Philosophy, that, *Operari presupponit esse*, a man must first be, before he can think or speak, or walk: And it is as certain a truth in Divinity, that *piè & justè operari, pre-supponit justum & pium esse*. It being impossible, that an Irregenerate, an impious and unjust person, should produce just and pious actions. *Men do not gather Grapes of Thorns, nor Figs of Thistles*, says our blessed Saviour). The premises considered, I do think, (and both the Ancient and Reform'd Churches are, and have been of the same opinion) that good works, (which follow Faith and our Justification, cannot possibly justify us so, as to constitute and make us just *coram Deo*. And *ergo*, Justification by works (in St. James) cannot (without manifest error and mistake) be so interpreted

ⁿ Matt. 7. 18.

A corrupt tree

cannot bring

forth good fruit.

Our blessed Sa-

vour urges the

argument from

the natural im-

possibility of a

bad tree, to the

moral impossibi-

lity of a bad

man, vid.

Matt. 7. 16,

17.

Luke 6. 45.

2. But as to the other sense of the word *Justification* though good works do not so justify, as to make us just *coram Deo*: Yet 'tis certain, that they are good evidences, which declare him who does them, to be indeed a justified person. *By their fruits you shall know them* (says our blessed Saviour) *The Children of God are manifest, by doing Righteousness* (says St. John,) and we

^o Matt. 7. 16,

20.

1 Joh. 3. 20.

9 1 Joh. 3. 14.
and 1 Joh. 3.
18, 19. and
1 Joh. 2. 29.
7 Article 12.
And Hom. pt.
1. p. 18. and
pt. 2. p. 82.
Good works are
Declarations
and Testimoni-
als of our justifi-
cation.

we know that we are pass'd from Death to Life (the Life of Faith whereby we are justified) because we Love the Brethren: And our Church tells, That a Lively Faith may as evidently be known by good works, as a Tree by the Fruit. So that when St. James says, That Abraham was justified by works: His meaning both may, and must be, that his works were clear evidences, that his Faith was not a dead and barren, but a fruitful and lively Faith, and he (by it) before justified.

3. And St. James himself gives manifest grounds of this, That good works (which are the fruits of Faith) are good evidences and declarations of a precedent Faith and Justification by it. For, 1. Speaking to those seeming Christians, (who thought Faith, though they lived impiously, would Save or Justify them, (for that's the Apostles meaning) he bids them demonstrate the truth of their Faith, by good works, and the fruits of it. *Ἰ δεῖξτε μοι, &c.* Shew me, or demonstrate to me the truth of thy Faith, by thy works. This they, who lived impiously, could not possibly do, and therefore he concludes, that their Faith (which had not such evidences to declare the truth of it) was a barren and dead Faith, (such as Devils had) and therefore could not justify. Next, ha-

f Jam. 2. 18.

† Ibid. ver. 19,
20.

ving

ving promis'd, (ver 18.) that he would shew them, that the Faith which alone can justify, was operative, and fruitful of good works, he instances in the Faith of *Abraham*; and proves (by Scripture) 1. That it was a justifying Faith, (such as theirs against whom he disputes, was not) *Abraham believed God* (says the Text) *and it was imputed to him for Righteousness*: His Faith did actually justify him. 2. He proves (by Scripture too) that it was not *barren faith*, but *fruitful of good works*; and he instances in that excellent work, of Sacrificing his Son: And then he adds, βλέπεις ὅτι ἡ πίστις συνήργει. seeest thou, (or thou seeest) that *Abraham's Faith* had good works accompanying it, which were visible evidences, that it was a true and justifying Faith. And hence it is manifest, that St. *James* speaks, 1. *Of a barren Faith*, which could not justify. 2. *Of a fruitful Faith* (such as *Abraham's* was) *which did justify*. 3. That he has not one word or Syllable, *that works did justify Abraham*, (or any body else) so as to constitute and make them just *coram Deo*: (which is the only thing you should have proved by the passage you cite out of St. *James*, and yet you neither do, nor endeavour it.) But (on the other side) St. *James* expressly says,

says, (what other Scriptures Antiquity, the Church of *England*, and all Reform'd Churches affirm) that good works are declarations, and sensible " evidences of saving Faith, and an antecedent Justification of the person who does them.

" Evidences
both,

1. To Angels,
Gen. 22. 11, 12.

2. To Men,
Matt. 7. 20.

3. To our own
Consciences,

1 Joh. 3. 14.

4. And that it may further appear, that when St. *James* says, we are justified by works : His meaning is not, that works justify us so, as to constitute and make us just before God ; but only that they justify so, as to be evidences whereby we are declared just to others, both Men and Angels : I shall set down St. *James* his words, (which you much mistake) and give you the plain, and (to me, and many more Learned Men) the true meaning of them ; the words are these, *Seest thou, how Faith wrought with his works, and by works was Faith made perfect, and the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, Abraham believed God, &c.* Where 1. Those words ; *Faith wrought with his works* ; signify the same thing, with those in St. *Paul*, *Faith which worketh by Love* ; that is, True Faith is always active and operative, this is confess'd by all. 2. Tho' the Apostle say, *it is not our own*, &c. *Faith wrought with his works* : Yet he neither does, (nor could truly) say, that they did co-operate to the same ends and purposes.

poses. For, *fides ad constitutionem, opera ad declarationem justitiæ operabantur*. Faith alone did constitute him just before God. For, (as you shall see anon) he was justified long before he Sacrificed his Son, and *ergo*. that act could not possibly concur to constitute him just, who was perfectly just, and continued so, many Years before that act had any being; It being impossible that act, or any thing else) should work before it was; and when it was, it did only co operate to a declaration of a previous and antecedent Justification.

2. And this further appears by what follows, *And by works* (says St. James) *Faith was made perfect*; (so we render those words in our Translation) *perfect*, not by communicating any perfection (essential or accidental) to *Abraham's* Faith; but by declaring it to be antecedently perfect. For as good fruit cannot possibly make, but pre-supposeth, a Tree good and perfect, but yet may manifest it to be so: So 'tis impossible, that any good works, the fruits of Faith, should constitute and make Faith perfect; yet they may, and do, declare that it is so.

3. And that which further confirms this Exposition, is, that the word here in St. James *inæwbn*, (which we render, *made perfect*; may, and (I believe) here must

G

must be render'd, declared to be perfect. For so the word (in Scripture usually signifies, *ἡ δύναμις μὲν ἐν ἀδυναμίᾳ τελείται.* *2 Cor. 12. 9.* My strength (says our most Gracious God) is made perfect; That is, declared to be perfect: It being absolutely impossible, that the Divine Perfection, which is ab eterno infinite, should in time be capable of any addition. So St. John, *καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ὁνομαζόμενος ἐν ἡμῖν, ἐτελειώθη ἐν ἡμῖν.* *1 Joh. 4. 12.* God dwells in us, and his Love, is perfected in us. That is, his Love is declared to be perfect. And (to omit all other such places) our blessed Saviour says of himself; *τὴν τρίτην ἡμέραν ἐτελειώμαι.* *Luk. 13. 32.* I shall be perfected, 'tis the same word. I shall be perfected; not by any addition of new, but by a further manifestation or declaration of his former and pre-existent perfection. So that the premises consider'd, I think, it may appear, that the words in St. James; *ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν ἐτελειώθη.* *James 2. 22.* both may, and must have this sense and meaning, that *Abraham's Faith* was by works manifested and declared perfect, not a dead and barren, but a lively fruitful and Justifying Faith. 4. When St. James says further, that when *Abraham* (*voto, licet non facto*) Sacrificed his Son; The Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, *Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness.* The meaning

So Heb. 7. 28.
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ
ἀσώβητος τετελειωμένος.
 (not consecrated but) perfected, (as in the Margent of our Bibles) being opposed in the Text, to ἀδυναμία. Nor could the Eternal Son of God be perfected, save by the manifestation of his perfection.

of this (notwithstanding what you, and some late mistaken Writers say) must be

1. Not that the Scripture was fulfilled, as a Propheſie is fulfilled; when a thing foretold, does afterwards come to paſs. For *Abraham* was (*de facto*) actually juſtified at leaſt 350 Years & before *Moses* was Born, and ſo long enough before there was any Scripture to be fulfill'd, by *Abraham's Sacrificing his Son*.

7 *Abraham was juſtified at or before his calling out of Haran, Heb. 11. 8. He was then 75 years old, Gen. 12. 4. Which was An. Mund. 2024. And Moses was Born, An. M. 2374 Which was 350 years after Abraham was juſtified.*

2. But the meaning of *St. James* is (and muſt be) this: That *Abraham's* Heroick act of Faith in Offering up his Son, was an evidence and demonſtration

1. Of the Truth of his Faith, that it was ſuch, as did really juſtify him. And

2. An evidence and demonſtration to others of the truth of that Scripture, which ſays, that it did juſtify him. For ſuch a Faith did, and none elſe could juſtify him. I ſay, to Others; becauſe that Scripture was writ to that purpoſe, to aſſure ^a all who ſhould come after, that ſuch a fruitful Faith as *Abraham's* was, would juſtify them.

^a Rom. 4. 23.

14. When it is ſaid (in the aforegoing objection, out of *St. James*) that *Abraham* was juſtified by works, when he offer'd up his Son: Becauſe *Papiſts, Socinians, Iou,* and ſome others of late, often urge it, for Juſtification by works, in ſuch a ſenſe,

14.

b Abraham was as the Apostle never meant : I shall (be-
justified by faith sides what is abovesaid) indeavour to
when he left Haran, Heb. 11.

8. rectify your mistake, by giving you some
Reasons, why St. James his meaning

He was then (saying Abraham was iustified by works)
75 years old, was not, that works did constitute, or
Gen. 12. 4. make him just before God : But only that

Isaac was Born An. Abraham, they were Evidences, which (a *posteriori*)
100. Gen. 21. 5. declared him justified by Faith before.

So that Abra- That this may appear, I do consider.
ham had been
justified 25 years

when Isaac was 1. That Abraham was really and actu-
born. Joseph ally justified by Faith, *b* Forty, or (if

says. (Lib. 2. Josephus reckon right) Fifty Years before
Antiq cap. 22.) he offer'd Isaac his Son ; and had continu-

that Isaac was ed in that Faith, Justice, and Friendship
25 years old, with God, all that time, till he did offer

when he was him. So that to say ; That act, (the
offer'd on the oblation of his Son) justified Abraham,

Altar ; Our is to say, it did that, which was really
Later Chronolo- and actually done (at least) Forty Years
gers say, he before.

was then. 2. The oblation of Isaac, was an act
26 years old. of that Faith, by which Abraham was
Take which ac- before justified *coram Deo* ; (as the Apostle

count you will, c tells us). And therefore, (if you will
Abraham was believe the Article of our *d* Church, which

50 or (at least) you have subscribed) That act (the ob-
49 years a jus- lation of his Son) was consequent, and
tified person, followed his Justification, and *ergo*. it

before he offer'd Isaac. c could not possibly be a cause or condition
c Heb. 11. 17. previous
d Art. 12.

previous and antecedent to it, and *ergo*. neither did, nor could justify him, *coram Deo*.

This does further, and evidently appear, from the Text it self, which tells us, That God tempted (or *e* tried) Abraham, and the Apostle cites that *f* place, *Gen. 21. 1.* *Heb. 11. 17.* *Αβραάμ πειραζόμενος, ἀπεσπίνοντο, &c.* By Faith Abraham when he was tried, offered up Isaac. God was pleased to lay that severe (and yet just) command upon him, that he should Sacrifice his Son, not with any intention, that he should be justified by that act, (for he was justified long before) but to try him, and put him to a proof and experiment of his Faith: So that by that act, the Sincerity of it, (that it was a lively, fruitful and justifying Faith) might be declared to Men and *g* Angels, *g* *Gen. 22. 11.* in that and after Ages, This is manifest *15.* in the Text, *h* And the Angel of the Lord, *Gen. 22. 12.* called to him, and said; Now I know, that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withholden thy Son, &c. This Heroick act, and good work of Abraham, was (*ex post-facto*) an evidence and demonstration, of the greatness and sincerity of his Faith, and fear of God, and consequently of his Justification *coram Deo*; and *ergo*. could not possibly constitute, or (as a previous

G 3

cause

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

cause or condition) make him just before God ; but only declare to Men and Angels that he before was so.

4. Had you read and understood, Rom.

4. 1, 2, 3. &c. (as by some passages in your Letter I am sure you do not) where St. Paul disputes (*ex professo*) of Abraham's Justification ; and ascribes it to Faith only, (all works secluded) had you consulted and understood the Ancient Fathers Exposition of it, and the Commentaries of later and Learned Protestant Divines, (and some sober Papists too) you might have found more Reason and Authority than you have for any thing you say, to believe, that though Abraham's good works might (and did) justify him, *coram hominibus*, (which is that St. James means, and acknowledges) yet not so *coram Deo*. Clemens Romanus (St. Paul's

Phil. 4. v. 3.

* Clemens Romanus, Epist. ad Cor. in bias, pag. 41. Edit. P. Junii.

contemporary and Fellow Labourer) would have told you ; that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, &c. were not justified by any of their good works, but by Faith only, * *οὐκ ἐκ ἔργων, &c.* Omnes igitur glorificati & Justificati sunt, non per Seiplos, aut eorum opera, aut Justificationes quas patrarunt. And then he adds, Sic nos in Christo vocati, non per nosmetipsos justificamur, neque per sapientiam nostram, intelligentiam, pietatem

pietatem, *vel* opera, *quæ* in puritate cordis, & sanctimonia operati sumus; sed per fidem, per quam Deus omnipotens omnes ab initio justificavit. Thus that most Ancient Father, and the rest (who speak of this Subject) for many Ages after him, although (I believe) you know it not. And having said before, that some Learned and Sober Papists (*vi veritatis victi*) were of the same Opinion; I shall (omitting others) Instance in one, who commenting on these words of St. Paul, *ex operibus legis, nulla caro justificabitur*: He hath these signal words, *Hoc signanter addit Apostolus, quia propter legem & opera, justificamur coram hominibus, sed coram Deo, qui corda intuetur, majus aliquid requiritur, nempe fides.* Observe (as he goes on) *duplicem justitiam, operum & fidei: Utraque necessaria Christiano, ut & coram Deo justus sit, & coram hominibus probatus.* Even an honest Popish Writer (convinc'd by the Text and Truth) doth confess, and expressly say; that there is, *justitia operum coram hominibus*, (of which St. James speaks) and *justitia fidei*, (of which St. Paul speaks) so that there is no opposition, (much less contradiction) between the positions of those two Apostles, nor any ground in either of them, (as you, and some others

k Rom. 3. 21.

l John Ferus in Rom. 3. 20.

p. 144. Edit. Mogunt. 1558.

I know, the Church of Rome (which no Re-form'd Church ever did) condemns this Doctrine of John Ferus, (in indice expurg.

Hispanico, in Joh. Ferro) which is a Com-mendation of it, and a great presumption, that it is true. Magnum aliquod bonum est, quod a Nerone (a Congregatione judicii) damnatur.

misconceive) for Justification by works
coram Deo.

5. Lastly, That neither the good work of *Abraham*, (in Sacrificing his Son) (how excellent soever) nor all his good works (how many soever did, or could justify *Abraham coram Deo*, (which is the only thing in Question; for that they did justify *coram hominibus*, is most certain, and confess'd) is evident. For 1. That any one good work (as *Abraham's* Sacrificing his Son) should justify any person, *coram Deo*; or (to use your *m* own words) That God should forgive his Sins for such work, is not only improbable, but manifestly irrational; never affirmed by any I have yet met with, (Protestant or Papist) besides your self, who barely (and without any pretence of proof) say it only. 2. That act of *Abraham* (as is aforesaid, and proved) was an effect and fruit of Faith, by which his Sins were pardoned, and he justified antecedently, and before that act had any Being; and therefore it was impossible, his Sins should be forgiven for doing that act, which were all actually forgiven, before *Abraham* produced it. 3. Your Mother the Church of *England*, might have taught you better Doctrine, that our most Gracious God does not forgive our Sins, for any one,

or

m In your Letter, p. 3. sub
finem.

or all our good works. For he plainly tells you, That to the Remission of Sins, (and so to our Justification) only three things are required. 1. Grace, (*ex parte Dei*). 2. Sanctification, (*ex parte Christi*). 3. A Lively Faith, (*ex parte Nostri*). And only such a Faith, and nothing else. Whence it evidently follows, that good works are not (as you pretend, and yet do not so much as pretend to any reason for it) required (on our part) to Remission of Sins, and Justification. 4. Nay, Cardinal Cajetan (a Person eminent in the Church of Rome, both for Place and Learning) might (had you been acquainted with him) have taught you better Divinity: And I shall (for your sake) here set it down. He commenting, on the Third Chapter to the Romans, (on these words, *By the deeds of the Law, shall no flesh be justified*). Tells us, 1. *Quod Paulus, Testimonio legis & Prophetarum declarat, non ex operibus legis, (hoc est non ex iustitia quorumcunque operum) justificari hominem simpliciter & absolute, sed ex iustitia Dei.* And then (a little after) He adds, *iustitia Dei per fidem, aperte significat, quod per iustitiam operum, nec Judæi, nec Gentes justificabantur, iustitiâ Remittente peccata; sed sola iustitia Dei, per fidem Jesu Christi.* Where the Cardinal tells us; That there is

ⁿ Our Homilies.
pt. 1. p. 14.

^o Card. Cajetan
in 3. ad. Rom.
v. 20, 21. 22.

is a two-fold Justice, 1. *Justitia remittens peccata, simpliciter sic dicta*; & hac est *justitia Dei per fidem*. 2. *Justitia non remittens peccata, nec simpliciter sic dicta*; & hac est *justitia operum*. And then He adds, *Inter justitiam operis & justitiam Dei, haec est differentia*; quod *justitia operis justificat tantum illud opus cujus cujus est, & operantem secundum habitum illius operis; non absolute, Quoniam non delet peccata, sed relinquit hominem in peccatis, quae fecit.* And (though you say, p. 4 That God remits our Sins, upon doing good works) this, which the Cardinal says, is evident. For admit *Sempronius* have committed only one Sin, and never Sin after, but perfectly keep the whole Law: Yet all those good works cannot justify him *coram Deo*, nor take away that one single Sin. All those good works are *officia & Deo (ex lege) debita, non merita*. They may justify *Sempronius* (as the Cardinal truly says) as to themselves, and the habits produced by them; *sed peccata non delent*, they cannot take away one single Sin. This said, (and most truly) the Cardinal goes on, *Justitia autem Dei, justificat hominem absolute, quoniam peccata quae inveniunt in homine, delet*. The Cardinal says further, (and truly) That *justitia Dei,*

p In your Letter p. 3.

Dei, the Righteousness of God, (which St. Paul so often mentions, and opposeth to all Justification by our own works, and inherent Righteousness) consists in the Satisfaction of our blessed Saviour. For there, he further says, and almost in the very words of our Homily) That three things are required to our Justification.

^q vid. Rom. 1. 17. and Rom. 3. 21, 22, 25, 26. Rom. 10. 3. Phil. 3. 9. &c. Cajetan in 3. ad Rom. v. 25. f Hom. pt. 1. p. 14.

1. Gratia Dei. 2. Iustitia Redemptoris. 3. Fides nostra in ejus Sanguine. Primum, (scilicet Gratia Dei) est causa secundi & tertii. Secundum (nempe iustitia Redemptoris) ita est gratiæ effectus, ut tamen Rationem iustitiæ dei constituit. Tertium, (scilicet fides) est applicatio & conjunctio utriusque nobiscum. Where 'tis evident, (in the Judgment of that great Cardinal) that Remission of Sins, and our Justification *coram Deo* (which only he and we now speak of) depends solely, (as to what is on our part required) upon our application of the Satisfaction and Justice of our blessed Saviour, by a Lively Faith, and not (as you mistake) upon any good works, which are the effects and fruits of it. And (to omit many such other passages in *Ferus*, in *Cassander*, *Erasmus*, *Stapalensis*, &c.) *Corn. Mussus* (one of the Trent-Authors, and by them highly magnified) tells us to the same purpose, "Constanter

^t vid. *Possevin*, in *Apparat. verbo Cornelius Mussus*. ^u *Corn. Mussus*, Episc. *Bisuntinus*, in Rom. 3. 28. p. 180. Col. 1. Edit. *Veneta*, 1588,

'assevera-

' asseveramus hominem apud Deum justifi-
 ' ficari per fidem, citra omnia legis opera,
 ' &c. And he adds, ' opera nulla locum
 ' habent in justificando hominem coram
 ' Deo: Unica fide justificantur universi
 ' homines apud Deum, sine operibus mo-
 ' ralibus, ceremonialibus, judicialibus cu-
 ' juscunque legis, vel Naturæ, vel Mosaicæ,
 ' vel Evangelicæ. Audis (says he) Pau-
 ' linam Sententiam, &c. So that when
 you say, (for these are your own words)
 ' We have Remission of Sins, and justifi-
 ' fication, by doing of Godly Works,
 ' which are the fruits of Faith; either you
 consider'd not, or (which is worse, though
 both are bad in a person of your Confide-
 nce) rejected the general consent and
 Judgment, not only of Antiquity, all
 Protestant Churches (especially ours of
England) but of Sober Popish Authors
 too.

15. Now having done with Scripture,
 and that place in *St. James*, (which is the
 only place you bring to prove your po-
 sition, and that miserably misunderstood)
 you come to Authority; and here, though
 it might have been expected, (from a
 person of your positive boldness) that you
 would have pretended (at least, and more
 you could not) to Fathers, Councils, Con-
 fessions

feſſions of any Reform'd Churches, or the
 Testimonies of the Pious and Learned
 Reformers of our own, or Foreign Churches.
 But you cite none of these, nor so much
 as any one passage out of any of them.
 You do indeed bring (and name them)
 Nine or Ten Witnesses to depose for your
 opinion. And although some of them,
 be my Reverend, Learned and Worthy
 Friends, Yet 1. You cite not any one,
 who writ any thing this way, before the
 Year, 1640. 2. Some of them, (for
 ought I yet find) have not writ any thing
 at all. 3. You neither tell me, what
 any one of them says for your opinion,
 nor where he says it. 4. If some of them
 should be of your opinion, (as I have rea-
 son to believe few are) yet I know not
 any reason, why their Judgment or Au-
 thority should conclude me, more than
 mine them. 5. But admit they were all
 of your opinion, and approved your new
 Hypothesis; (which is untrue) yet they
 are neither Fathers, nor Infalible: And
 their Joynt-Testimony (if you had it)
 does not amount to a probable argument,
 (if *Aristotle* define right) much less a con-
 vincing proof, for the truth of that po-
 sition, and Hypothesis, which you would,
 (but neither do, nor can) maintain: 6.

Probabile est,
quod ab omni-
bus, plerisque,
vel Sapientibus,
iisque vel omni-
bus vel Sapien-
tissimis, asseri-
tur, Aristoteles
Topicor. lib. 1.
If this be so,
then the consent
of your 9 or 10.
witnesses (if they
did consent)
could not a-
mount to a pro-
bable Argu-
ment, much
less demonst-
ation.

For

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

For your Nine or Ten Witnesses, for your opinion of Justification by works, I shall name, (and you only name yours) a Thousand times as many; who have actually, (and before any of your Witnesses were Born) given express Testimony to the contrary Doctrine, and against Justification by any inherent Righteousness: And these, as in number far more; so in Learning and Piety, not inferior to any of yours. 1. So *Wicliff, Hus, Jerome of Prague, Luther, Melancthon*, and the Antient Reformers, and their followers (in the Churches beyond the Seas) to this day. 2. So *Jewel, Reynolds, Hooker, Whittaker, Davenant, Crakanthorp, Field, John White, Downham*, and generally the Divines of our Church, before our late unhappy Civil Wars; when too many cast off Loyalty to the King and Duty to their Mother the Church of *England*. 3. Had you consulted that Famous, and (though may be not to you) well known Book ^x called *Liber Concordia*; you might have found this Doctrine, (which is yours) Damn'd as Anabaptistical, (*Soci- nus* his Doctrine had then that Name) 'Quod Justitia nostra coram Deo, non tantum in Sola Obedientia, et unico Christi Merito, verum etiam in nostra renovatione,

^x *Liber Concordia, Lipsia,*
1580 40.

‘renovatione, & propria justitia consistit. They thought it an Anabaptistical Error, for any man to say (as you do) That any works, or the inherent Justice even of a Renewed and Regenerate man, or any thing but the Obedience and Merits of our blessed Saviour, did justify any man *coram Deo*. Now there subscribed to this Book and Doctrine, (in contradiction to yours) no less than Three Electors of the Roman Empire, 21 Princes, 22 Counts, 4 Barons, 35 Free Cities. And 8000 Ministers (as a Learned Man has computed the number of those Subscribers) These Testimonies, (consider them what way you will, ‘numero aut pondere) extant on Publick Record, will (I hope) be more significant even to you, than your Nine, or (at most) Ten supposed, (for they are but supposed) Witnesses. 4. And which is yet more; I do say, (and when there is a just occasion, shall (God willing) make it good) That not only our Church, but all the Reform’d Churches in Europe, (as by their publick Confessions, may, and does appear) have declared against your Novel Hypothesis, and that we neither are, nor can be justified *coram Deo*, by our own works, and inherent Righteousness. 5. As for

*Vincentius
Placcius Syntag.
de Scriptis &
Scriptoribus,
Anonymis.
Hamburgi.
1674. P. II.*

*Vide Corpus,
Confessionum,
Edit 1612.
vel 1654.*

the

the Testimonies of the Fathers, and the ancient Church, (in whose works, I perceive you are not very well vers'd, because you cite none, all the Authorities you cite (except one, and he lately dead) being now living) they are so many, and so express against your Hypothesis; that had you impartially read, and understood them, you would either not have entertain'd, or alter'd that opinion, which now you unadvisedly defend. For the Testimonies of the Fathers, you might (and may) find many of them cited to your hand, in any of our Protestant Divines, who have writ against *Rome*, on the Article of Justification, and more particularly, in that *Corpus Confessionum*, (but now cited) you have a Collection of many such places, with distinct references to the Writings of the Fathers, where they may be found.

16.

16. In the Postscript of your Letter, having said, 'That Justification was 'God's pardoning of Sin upon the doing 'of Godly works. You there add, 'And 'what harm there can be in such Doctrine, 'you are too weak sighted to perceive. To this, I say, 1. That I am apt to believe, that you are weak sighted; both because you say it, (though otherwise,

very

very few of your sayings deserve, or have my belief) and because your many mistakes, and the weakness of your Reasoning, give me strong reason to believe, that you are indeed (in Divinity) very weak sighted: Which weakness (if natural) may be your Calamity; but if by Voluntary neglect of means, and idleness, your Crime.

2. But though you can see no harm in your Doctrine of Justification by your own works; yet you might (and ought to) have seen harm in it. For it is the Judgment of our Church (which you have subscribed)

That whoever denies Justification by Faith Only, is not to be accounted a Christian Man, nor a Setter forth of Christ's Glory; but an adversary to Christ, and his Gospel, and a Setter forth of Men's vain glory. And that you might not, (as weakly or wilfully you do) mistake our Churches meaning; she tells you.

1. In the Text, (page 17.) That we are justified only by a Lively Faith in Christ. 2. And (page 16.) you have this Note in the Margent. The profit of the Doctrine, that Faith only justifies.

3. And again in the Margent, (page 17.) What they be who repugne the Doctrine (as you unadvisedly do) that Faith only justifies.

a Hom. pt. 1.
p. 16. in calce
pagina, & pa.
17. in prin.

b Art. 11. 12.

justifies. The meaning of our Church, both in her Articles and Homilies (as is before observ'd, and I hope, proved) undeniably is, That we are accounted Righteous before God, only for the Merits of our Blessed Saviour. They being, 'Unica & Sola Ratio & causa, quæ Remissionem peccati & iustitiam impetrat, and a Lively Faith, causa unica & Sola, 'quæ Christi Merita & Satisfactionem, 'Animæ peccatrici, in medelam & iustitiam applicat. Our good works, neither Meriting Remission of Sins, (as is confess'd nor any way applying those Merits (so as we have the benefit of them) which only can do it: Seeing 'tis evident, (as before is said and proved) that our good works are fruits of Faith, which (as their cause) follow it, and ergo. cannot possibly be either cause or condition antecedent to our Justification.

17.

c Jam. 2. 24.

17. But you go on (after your usual rate) and say, 'You do not think it unlawful, for a Man to Preach on that 'Text of St. James, 'You see, that a Man is justified by works, and not by Faith only. 'And if he do Preach on that Text, and Preach not up Justification by works, he will make a strange 'Sermon; and more strange, if he should (from

‘(from thence) Preach against all justification by any Works. 2 These be your words. Now in Reply to this Saying of yours, (which needs no serious answer) I shall return another saying, in your words, (which will require your answer, as much as yours mine) thus, ‘I do think it lawful for a man to Preach on that Text of St. Paul, Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by Faith, without the works of the Law: And if he do Preach on that Text, and Preach not up Justification by Faith, he will make a Strange Sermon, and more strange, should he (from thence) Preach against all Justification by Faith. This saying of Mine, will concern you to consider, as much as yours me. For if yours signify, that we are justified by works; mine on the same grounds will as truly signify, that we are justified by Faith without them. 2: But that I may meekly give you all the satisfaction I can, (for it is not victory, but Truth and your Information I seek) I grant. 1. That to Preach on that Text you mention, is so far from being unlawful; that it is both lawful, expedient, and (in some cases) necessary for a Divine, to Preach upon, and explain that Text, and recon-

d In your
Postscript.

cile the seeming Contradiction between that, and some other Texts in Scripture.

2. I grant, that we may Preach upon that Text, and not Preach up Justification by works, in that sense you intend; and yet the Sermon be no way strange, but very true and usual. Because I know many good Preachers and Commentators, (Ancient and Modern) explain that Text, and yet, are so far from Preaching up Justification by good works *coram Deo*; (which is, and must be, your sense, if it be pertinent to your Position and Hypothesis) that they Preach and prove the direct contrary; that our good works neither do, nor can justify us before God, and at the Tribunal of his Severe, and most Righteous Judgment. 3. And when you say, 'That it would be more strange, if (on that Text) he should Preach against all Justification by any works. This I grant, is true, but impertinent. For it being confess'd by all, that good works do justify us, *coram hominibus*; certainly no man (*cui delicta operis, & Sannum Sinciput*) ever did, or ever could, (without contradicting his Text and Truth) Preach on that (or any other) Text, against all Justification, by any works.

18. But

18. But you go on, and say, 'That
'Remission of Sins and Justification are
'(in our Homilies) twice asserted to be
'the same thing. Which (say you) is
'clear enough, against some Neotericks,
'who will have Justification consist, in
'the Pardon of our Sins, and Imputation
'of our Blessed Saviours Righteousness;
'of which (say you) neither Homily nor
'Scripture say any thing.

Now here, (that you may see how
vain and irrational such talk is) (give
me leave to tell you (what is evidently
true). 1. That you say indeed, 'that
'in our Homilies, Justification and Re-
'mission of Sins, are twice call'd the
'same thing. But you neither tell us,
in which part of that Book, or what
particular Homily, or in what respect,
or how far, they are call'd the same thing.
2. You say, 'that this is clear enough
'against some Neotericks, who hold the
'Imputation of our Blessed Saviours Right-
'eousness, to concur to our Justification:
But you neither tell us, who those Neo-
tericks are, where, or how they hold it,
or by what deduction and just consequence
it becomes so clear, that the Imputation
of our Blessed Saviours Righteousness
does not concur to our Justification: which

certainly, you should have done, before (with so much confidence) you condemn me, and those that you call Neotericks, for saying, (as you suppose, and I grant) that the Imputation of our Blessed Saviours Righteousness does (and of necessity must) concur to the Justification of a Sinner. For certainly you cannot think, (and if you do, you are much mistaken) that your *Auds* *teas* your unproved sayings, and bare dictates (for Reasons you bring none) should pass with me (or any body else) for Oracles, or convincing proofs. 3. What consequences you may phantasie to follow, from the words of the Homily, which you cite, I know not: But sure I am; 1. That the words you cite, are only these. 'The Homily does twice call Justification and Remission of Sins, the same thing.' 2. That all the consequence which you do, or can bring from those words, is only this, Justification and Remission of Sins are the same thing. *Argo*. Justification consists not in the Imputation of our Blessed Saviours Righteousness. So your Argument (such as it is) inform, is thus, 'Our Justification consists not in that which is no Remission of Sins. For (you say) Remission and Justification are the same thing.'

But

‘ But the Imputation of our Blessed Saviours Righteousness, is no Remission of Sins. Being (I grant) the cause and motive why God does remit, and not the Remission it self.

‘ Ergo, Our Justification consists not in such imputation of our Blessed Saviours Righteousness.

This is your Argument; which if it be cogent and concluding, it will (by the same Logick) evidently follow,

1. That our justification consists not in believing in Jesus Christ, and yet that Text expressly says, that Faith in him does justify. For believing in our Blessed Saviour, is no more Remission of Sins, than the Imputation of his Righteousness, in which, you say, our justification does not consist.

Joh. 3. 15.
16.
Rom. 5. 1.

2. And from the same principle, it must (by your Logick) necessarily follow; that our justification cannot consist in doing any good works, which are the fruits of Faith. For if it be true, (and you say it is) that justification consists only in Remission of Sins; then it cannot consist in doing good works. For 'tis evident, that doing good works, is no remission of wicked ones already done.

He 4

3. If

3. If Justification and Remission of Sins, be so the same thing, that Justification consists in nothing but such Remission; then, it does not consist in the Free Grace and Mercy of God. For that Mercy and Grace, are the prime efficient cause and principle of Remission, and *ergo*. cannot possibly be the Remission it self; which is a subsequent effect, which has its being from that cause.

So that by your unadvised Sophistry (reason I neither do, nor can truly call it) you have shut out from our Justification (as things in which it does not consist, seeing you say, it consists only in Remission of Sins) all these particulars,

1. The Free Grace and Mercy of God.

2. The Imputed Righteousness of our Blessed Saviour.

3. A Lively Faith in his Blood, in contradiction to Scripture.

4. And all good works too; and so you contradict your own Hypothesis, and (though I believe, you neither intended nor knew it) confute your self: and which

which is of much more moment (though you have not consider'd it) you contradict the expresse Doctrine of our Church and the Apostle. For our Homily truly tells us; ^f that the Apostle requires Three ^f Hom. pt. 1. things to go together in our justification, ^{p. 14.} (in which it does, and necessarily must consist) 1. On Gods part, Mercy and Grace. 2. On our blessed Saviours part, Justice, or Satisfaction, of Gods Justice. 3. On our part, a Lively Faith only; and therefore not works; as you (it seems) do, and would have me believe. So that our Church, (out of the Apostle) expressly requires Three Things, which must (of necessity) concur to our justification, (without which it cannot consist) and yet you tell us, (with your usual confidence) that it consists only in (that which is none of the Three, to wit) Remission of our Sins.

In short; if you take Justification as it is *Actus Dei peccata remittentis*: and consider it 1. *Respectu Dei, cujus est actus*: so Grace and the Mercy of God are necessarily and antecedently required to Remission of Sins. It being most certain, that it is of his Grace and Mercy, that he remits them. 2. *Respectu objecti, ad quod actus Remissionis terminatur*, i. e.

peccatum remissum, and that object of Remission is either. 1. *Objectum materiale*, the Sin it self, which is remitted. Or, 2. *Objectum formale*, which is the impulsive cause or motive why it is remitted: and so the Merits and Righteousness of our blessed Saviour made ours by Faith, is the one, and only motive, why Sin ever was, or ever will be remitted. But of this more anon.

Now seeing (by your own forementioned argument) you have excluded works from our justification; I shall (for better reasons) concur with you in that particular, that our good works do not justify us: and that the Church of *England* is of the same judgment, may further appear, by a place or two (not mentioned before) which here follow, 1. Then, our Church

g Hom. 1. pt.
p. 13

says, & no man can (by his own works, be they never so good) be made righteous before God: but we must seek another righteousness, or justification, to be received at Gods own hands; that is, for giveness of our Sins. And this justification or righteousness, received of Gods Mercy and Christs Merits, imbraced by Faith, is accepted of God for our perfect and full justification. So you see here is perfect and full justification without works, or any mention of them, as

any

any way concurring to it. Nay our works (be they never so good) are by our Church expressly excluded from having any hand in our justification. And therefore, I think it evident, that our Church renounceth all inherent righteousness, and plainly says; that we must have another Righteousness to justify us before God: And we must receive it of God himself, for Christ's Merits and by Faith. (we neither receive it by works, nor for them.) That is, (as you shall see anon) our blessed Saviours Righteousness, which he (as our Surety and Mediator) perform'd for us, and his Father accepted in full Satisfaction for all our sins, and imputed it to us; This (I say, and so does our Church here, and in her ⁴ Article, and all the Reform'd Churches) only is that righteousness which does, or can justify a sinner, *coram Deo*. 2. And in the same Homily a little after, all the ancient Authors (Greek and Latin) say, that we are justified only by a lively Faith in Christ. (all our works utterly excluded) And St. Basil saith, that it is our whole rejoycing in God, when we do not advance our own Righteousness, but acknowledge the want of true Righteousness, and to be justified only by Faith in Christ.

b Article 11.

i Hom. of Salvation, 2 pt, p. 16.

& Phil. 3.8,9.
which place is
cited in the
Homily.
Ibid p. 18.

‘Christ. And St. *Paul* (says the Homily
‘out of *Basil*) doth glory in the contempt
‘of his own & Righteousness, and that he
‘looked for the Righteousness of God by
‘Faith. And a little¹ after, (in the conclu-
‘sion of that Homily) as great and godly
‘a Vertue as Faith is; yet it puts us from
‘it self, and remits us to Christ, to have
‘remission of Sins and justification by him
‘only: and does (as it were) say unto us,
‘thus, It is not I, that taketh away your
‘Sins, but Christ only, and to him only I
‘send you, forsaking therein, all your ver-
‘tues, words, thoughts, and works, and
‘only putting your trust in Christ. It is
not possible, more plainly and fully to ex-
clude all (even our best works) from ha-
ving any hand in our justification.

^m Your Let-
ter p. 1.

But (let the Fathers, and our Church
say what they will) you do not like that
phrase; that Faith justifies. You ^m tell us,
that it is not Scriptural. For (say you)
‘in Scripture, it is always in the passive,
‘we are justified by Faith; but never in
‘the active, that Faith does justifie. To
this, I say, 1. This you say, with your
usual confidence, and mistake, against
Truth, and the express Doctrine of your
Mother the Church of *England*: which
tells you, that both Scripture and Fa-
thers use it in an active sense, ⁿ The Scrip-
ture

ⁿ Hom. p. 1.
p. 19.

'ture useth to say, that Faith doth justify,
'and only Faith doth justify. And the
'Old Fathers say, that only Faith justifieth.
These are the very words of the Homily,
which you have subscribed, and here in
your Letter (without any respect to
Truth, or your Mother) evidently con-
tradicted. 2. But admit what you say,
it is impertinent. For to say, we are
justified by Faith, and that Faith justifies,
are equivalent expressions: and whoever
says the one expressly, does implicitly,
(and as really and truly) say the other.
As he who says *Titius* was killed by a
Sword, or wounded with a Pike (in the
passive sense) does, by evident conse-
quence, say (in the active sense) that
the Sword did kill, and the Pike did
wound him. Will it not signify the same
thing, if I say, you write an erroneous
Letter, or such a Letter was writ by
you? So he who affirms, that we are
justified by Faith; does (implicitly) and
(consequentially) must affirm, that Faith
does justify.

All you say, in answer to such passages
in our Homilies, which exclude works
from our Justification before God, is on-
ly this. 'That they are excluded, as to
'Merit, they do not deserve or merit
'justi-

'justification; but they are Conditions, (or, as some say, *causa sine qua non*) upon performance whereof, we are justified *coram Deo*. In answer to this (which deserves none) I shall desire you to consider,

1. That you only say this, without any pretence of proof; and you do prudently, not to pretend to that, which you cannot possibly perform. For certainly neither Scripture, nor Fathers, neither our own, nor any Reform'd Church afford you any ground to say, as you do: 'That good works are Conditions, upon performance whereof, we are justified, *coram Deo*.

2. Nay Scripture, Fathers, the Reform'd Churches, (in their publick Confessions, and private writings of their Divines) our own Church in her Articles and Homilies (as may, I hope, appear by the premises) expressly say, That (*ex parte nostra*) Faith is the only condition required on our part (as our Homily expressly says.) then 'tis evident, that good works are not required, as a Condition to be performed by us, in *ordine ad justificationem coram Deo*.

3. If good works be a Condition, on performance whereof, we are justified:

then

o St. Paul declareth, that nothing, on the behalf of Man, is required, concerning his justification, but only a lively Faith. So says our Homily of Salvation. pt. 1. p. 14.

then they must precede our justification, (for you say, That we are justified, upon doing good works, which are the fruits of Faith) And yet our Church says, that our good works follow Faith and our justification.

^p In the Post-script of your Letter, p. 3.

^q Article 12.

4. If good works be *Conditio Novi Fœderis*, then 'tis a Covenant of works: for it has it's Name from the Condition. For so the old Covenant, *Fœdus Opum*, was therefore call'd *Fœdus operum*, because works were the Condition to be perform'd on man's part; and so will the New Covenant be a Covenant of works, if works be the Condition. 'Tis true, that perfect works (and obedience) were the Condition of the Old Covenant: But (as your Hypothesis is stated) works and obedience less than perfect, (so it be sincere) will be sufficient to justify the Doer of them, by the Tenor of the New Covenant. This being granted, it alters not the Sense. *Majus & minus non mutant speciem.* * Let works be perfect, or imperfect, it will be a Covenant of works, so long as works are the Condition of it.

2. And further (according to your new Hypothesis, rightly consider'd) the Evangelical and New Covenant, will be a Covenant of perfect works, as well as the Old

* See Bulkly of Covenant. 331.

Old and Legal one. For works are then said to be perfect, when they have an exact proportion and conformity with that Law, which is the Rule and measure of their Perfection. So works in the Old Covenant, are then perfect, when they are conformable to the Natural, or Moral Law, which is the Rule and measure of their Perfection; and in the New, when they are conformable to the Evangelical Law. I demand then; are the good works, which (you say) do justify us, as the Condition of the New Covenant, conformable to the Evangelical Law, which requires them, or are they not? If not, then they cannot justify; For no condition of any Covenant (Legal or Evangelical) can justify, unless it be performed exactly, according to the Law of that Covenant which requires it. *Conditione enim faderis non prestita, promissum in fadere, (quic quid demum fuerit) non erit debitum.* But if they be exactly conformable to the Evangelical Law, which requires them, then are they perfect works; and then the Gospel-Covenant will be a Covenant not only of works; (in respect of the Condition it requires to our Justification) but of perfect works too; which is utterly inconsistent with the

the nature of the New Covenant, which is a Covenant of *p* grace, not of works, *p* Eph. 2. 8, 9. which further appears.

5. From what the Apostle tells us, when he expressly proves; that *Abraham* was not justified by works, but by Faith. *To him that worketh* (says he) *the Reward is reckon'd, not of Grace, but of Debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, Faith is counted for Righteousness.* Where (by St. Pauls Argument) it is evident, that the Evangelical Justification is not a Debt due to us, for the performance of any works done by us. And hence it as evidently follows, that we are not justified by our good works, perform'd as the Condition of the Gospel Covenant. For if good works be such a condition of our Justification, then the performance of them, makes the promise a Debt (*ex vi faderis*) due to us. For it is undeniably certain, (and for ought I know denied by none) *Quod conditione faderis cuiuscunque præstita, promissum (Quod cunque demum fuerit) conditionem illam præstanti, est (ex vi faderis, & de jure) debitum.* If then, our good works be such a condition of the New Covenant, as that by doing them we are justified *coram Deo*: then

* I (posita

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

(*positâ & præstitâ conditione operum*) our Justification will be a just debt, and (by our fulfilling that condition) due to us. So if *Titius* promise *Sempronius* 20 *l.* for going a Mile, on some business for him: and promise the same Sum to *Cajus*, for going an 100 Miles, on the like business. The 20 *l.* will be as much a due debt to *Sempronius*, who goes but one, as to *Cajus*, who goes an 100 Miles. The Sum of the premises is this: let the conditions of a Covenant be what they will, (more or less, great or little) if they be perform'd according to the Tenor of that Covenant, wherein they are requited, upon such performance, the promise contained in the Covenant becomes a debt, (*ex justitiâ & vi federis*) due. And therefore, if good works (consisting not in an absolutely perfect, but only in a sincere obedience) be the condition required and sufficient to our justification, then 'tis certain and evident, that upon doing such good works, our justification becomes a just debt, which (*ex vi federis*) we may challenge as most due. Which (I am perswaded) no Saint or Servant of God ever did, or will, or (without great Pride and Pernicious error) can. You may possibly now talk of your good works, (and performing the condition

dition of the Covenant, by those works) and being justified by them; but when you shall come, and appear at the dreadful Tribunal of a most just God; when your Conscience shall be awake, and set all your Sins before you, in their full number and magnitude; you will be (I doubt not) of another opinion; and say with *David*, (who might have pleaded good works, as much as you) *Ne intres (Domine) in judicium cum Servo tuo.* I say, when you shall come before that Great and Just Judge, you will reject your own works, and inherent Righteousness, and rely upon the sufferings and satisfaction of our blessed Saviour, and the Justice purchased for us by it, and say, as a late Learned and Pious^r Prelate did (in his Last Will and Testament) *I commend my Soul to God, beseeching him, not to look upon it as it is in it self, infinitely polluted with Sin, (no mention of good works, or performance of the condition of the Covenant by them, though had there been any such thing, he might justly have pleaded and depended upon it. But as it is Redeemed, and Purged with the Precious Blood of Christ. In confidence of whose Merits alone (not of his performance of the Condition of the Co-*

q D. Sanderfon
late Bishop of
Lincoln.
See his Life
by Isaac Wal-
ton, London
1678. p. 179,
180.

venant by his own works) 'it is, that
'I cast my self upon his Mercy for the
'Pardon of my Sins. So that Pious and
very Learned and Judicious Person.

Dub.

But it may be objected ; that (if this
be true) *Quod conditione federis præstita,
promissum erit (ex justitiâ) debitum.* Then
it will be all one, whether Faith or works
be the Condition of the New Covenant.
For if Faith be the Condition ; then
(*conditione posita*) If I believe, the thing
promised (or justification) will be a
debt as due to the Believer, as it would
be to the works, if works were the con-
dition, and by him perform'd. This ob-
jection you do not make ; but (because
it is not victory I seek, but Truth and
your Information) I have both made it,
and (Σὺν Θεῷ) hope to answer it so, that
you may receive satisfaction.

Sol.

In answer therefore to this objection ;
I say, 1. That admitting (what is ma-
nifestly untrue) that our good works
were a condition antecedent to our justi-
fication (as Faith is) yet to conclude
from thence, that the performance of
either condition (Faith or works) did e-
qually infer a Debt, is utterly inconse-
quent. For 2. In the Apostles dis-
course, grace and works are oppos'd, and
he

r Rom. 4. 4. &c

he expressly says, That the performance of works doth infer a debt, but Faith (though justification infallibly follow it) does not. *To him that worketh* (saith the Apostle) *the Reward is not reckon'd of Grace, but of Debt.* But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, faith is counted for Righteousness. 3. Nay, though Faith justify us; yet 'tis so far from following (by any just consequence) that justification is a debt; that St. Paul concludes the direct contrary; That our Justification is of grace, because by Faith, *Therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace.* The reason of this is manifest, for Faith it self is a grace, *purum putum Dei donum*, An effect of the Holy Spirit. 'Tis a grace infused, (not acquired by our acts and industry) as is acknowledged by Protestants and Papists too, (though Socinus, and his followers (as they do many other Truths) without reason deny it) and they have express Scripture for it, *By grace you are Saved through Faith, and that not of your selvas, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any Man should boast.* Our good works are our own, we are the principal efficient cause of them, and they constitute our inherent Righteousness; which

Ibid ver. 5.

Rom. 4. 16.

Gal. 5. 22.

Eph. 2. 8.

∗ Phil. 3. 9.
vid. Hom. pt. I
p. 61

Paul calls τὸ ἰδίον δικαιοσύνην his own Righteousness: (His own. 1. *Ratione Subjecti*, as the subject in which it is. 2. *Ratione Principij*, as the cause and principle from whence it is) which he opposeth to the imputed Righteousness of Christ, ∗ He desires to be found in Christ, not having his own Righteousness, which is of the Law, but that which is through the Faith of Christ, the Righteousness which is of God by Faith. Now if the Righteousness of works were the condition of the New Covenant, and perform'd exactly by us. we might have some pretence to boast and glory (though not before God, yet) before Men, and the promise would be (*ex justitiâ*) due to us, as a debt (as the Apostle tells us) I say, if all the good works, which are required, as the condition of the New Covenant, were exactly performed: otherwise, if the least part or particle of the Condition, be not perform'd, nothing is due but Death, which is the sad consequent of the non-performance of that Covenant. For as in Temporal and civil Contracts, if *Sempronius* Covenant with *Cajus*, that he shall have the possession and benefit of such Lands, if he duly pay him 100*l.* per Annum; otherwise to forfeit his Right and Possession

tion. In this case, if *Cajus* either cannot, or neglect and will not pay that Sum at the time appointed; if one pound or shilling of the Sum be not paid, the condition is not perform'd, and so his Right is forfeited. So in the Gospel Covenant, if the Condition be not exactly perform'd, nothing is due but Death. But if the Condition be perform'd, the promise will be a debt, and (for such performance) *ex justitiâ* due. On the other side, Faith being the only condition (on our part), *from part 1. pag. 14.* required of us. (and that not as the thing for which we are Justify'd *coram Deo*, but for the apprehension and application of our Blessed Saviours merits and satisfaction, for which & only we are Justify'd; and *Articles of Religion. Artic. 18.* faith (as the Apostle says) *not of our selves, but a pure Grace and Gift of God*: it is impossible, that there should be any thing of debt in this case; where both the sending of our Blessed Saviour, and that Faith, by which we have a Right and Title to his sufferings and Satisfaction, are solely from the free Grace and Gift of God. For (as in a less, but like case) If *Tisius* (a Generous and Charitable Person) find out a Farm of an 100*l. per Annum*; tell *Sempronius* (a Poor Man) that it may be Purchased with such a Sum;

Sum ; and withal give that Sum to *Sempronius*, to buy that Farm. Certainly, no Man can say that *Titius* the Benefactor can be Indebted in this case to *Sempronius*, for buying that Farme ; (which *Titius* found out, and then gave him the Money, with which he bought it.) And much less, can there be any thing of Debt, (in our case) wherein God of his Infinite and Free mercy, shews us.

^a John 3. 15,
16, &c.

^b Rom. 3. 24,
25.

^c Eph. 2. 8, 9.

^d Rom. 3. 27.
and 4. 2. and
1 Cor. 30. 31.

1. That Salvation ^a may be had by his Son. 2. That it may be had on condition of a true and lively ^b Faith. 3. And then freely ^c gives that Faith. I say, 'tis impossible here, that any thing should be of Debt, *where every thing is of Grace and free Gift.* So that in our Justification by Faith, both debt and ^d boasting are evidently shut out, as (by the Apostles Doctrine) they ought ; but if Justification were by works, (as you pretend) then there would be a manifest ground (contrary to the Apostle) for debt and boasting too.

6. But though you call good works a condition, upon doing of which we are justified ; yet others (as *Socinus*, and some others, who unadvisedly follow him) say, that they are only *causa sine qua non*, of our justification, where I observe, 1. That

That

That the old saying (in *Jamblicus*) is true, *ἡ τὸ ἀληθὲς, πολυχρὲς τὸ ψεῦδος*, Truth is one, and consonant with it self, but error is not so. For these two answers, as they are both manifestly erroneous; So they contradict each other. For 2. If our good works be (as you say) *Conditio novi faderis*, upon doing whereof, we are justified, then they are Moral and Real Causes of our Justification. For, *Conditio præstita, est ratio, causa, motivum, & illud propter quod promissum in fadere, est (ex jure) debitum*. But if they be only *causa sine qua non*, (as they call them) then they are only Concomitants, and have no Causality. 3. Nor indeed can good works be so so much as *causa sine qua non*, of our Justification. Because 'tis evident, (and ^a confess'd by you) that ^{a Your Letter page 1.} we may be, and are justified without them: being (at first) justified by Faith alone, before we have (or can have) any good works, which are always consequents and fruits of Faith which follow ^b our justification. 4. And after we are ^{b Heb. 11. Eph. 2. c, 10. Article of our Religion. 12.} actually justified, how many times do we want good works, to be *justitiæ Comites*, and *causa sine qua non*? Always when we are fast a-sleep, and do not so much as Dream of them; and too many times, when

when we are wakeing. How many times do we actually Sin? And for some time continue in it, and want all good works: (for certainly, we do no good works, while we are actually doing wicked ones) 5. In a word, had you Read, Understood, and Remember'd our Homilies: you might have found many evident reasons, why good works can neither be necessary conditions, or *causa sine qua non*, of our Justification: Seeing (in the judgment of our Church) a Man may (in some cases) have Justification and Salvation too, without them. I can shew you a Man, (they are the words of our Homily) who by Faith, without works, lived, and came to Heaven: But without Faith, never any Man had Life. Then an Instance follows, (which St. *Augustine*, and many Ancient and Modern Divines since, have made use of to the same purpose) thus, The Thief who was Hanged, when our Blessed Saviour Suffered, did believe only, and the Most Merciful God justified him, &c. It is (you see) the express judgment of St. *Augustine*, and our Church; That (in some case) a man may be justified by Faith only, when there are no good works at all (Antecedent, Concomitant, or Subsequent) to concur with

c Homily of
Good works.
pt. 1. pag. 32.

d *Augustin. lib.*

Quest. 80.

Quest. 76. Tom.

4. pag. 898.

Quod si quis

cūm crediderit.

mox ex hac

vita decesserit,

Justificatio

Fidei manet

cum illo, nec

præcedentibus

bonis Operibus,

nec subsequenti-

bus, &c. So

St. Augustine,

and our Church.

with it any way : and *ergo*. good works are no necessary condition, or *causa sine qua non* of our justification.

7. But admit (which is evidently untrue) that good works were *causa sine qua non*, of our justification : That is, that they were always co-existent with it, in every person justified ; (for to the nature of *causa sine qua non*, co-existency only, and no causality is required) yet it is impertinent to say, (in opposition to justification only for our Blessed Saviours Merits and Satisfaction by Faith only) that we are so justified by works ; nor can such a saying have any sense in it. For 1. Our Natural Faculties (our Will and Understanding) are properly *causa sine qua non* of our justification (perpetually and necessarily co existing with our justification, in every person who is justified) and yet none ever said, that our Will and Understanding (those natural Faculties) did any way justify us. 2. Nay, our Sensitive Faculties, as the powers of Hearing, Seeing, &c. And our Corporal Parts (as our Head, Heart, Lungs, Stomach, &c.) are *causa sine qua non*, without which, no Man was ever justified : for without these, none ever was a Man, and therefore to be sure no Justify'd

Justify'd Man. And yet, as no Man ever said, that these bodily parts or sensitive faculties did justify us; so it were impertinent and irrational, and ridiculous to say they did.

^a Your Letter
page 3. In the
Postscript.

8. You say further, ^a 'That some *Neotericks* hold, that our Justification consists partly in the imputation of Christ's Righteousness, of which neither our Homily, nor Scripture say any thing. And here I do (and desire you to) consider, 1. That these things you do indeed confidently say, but (as usually) without any pretence of proof, and therefore, without any reason, why I (or any body else) should believe you. 2. You say, 'some *Neotericks* hold, that our justification consists partly in the imputation of our blessed Saviours Righteousness. Intimating, that *Neotericks* only; and but some of them hold so. Whereas had you diligently read and understood, (as I fear you have not) Scripture, the Ancient Fathers, the publick Confessions of Protestant Churches, (especially our own, in her Articles and Homilies) and the approved Writings of their Pious and Learned Divines; you might have found their concurrent and constant belief of the imputed Righteousness of our Blessed Saviour,

Saviour, concurring to our justification. Sure I am that all the Learned Divines, and dutiful Sons of the Church of *England*, who have writ of our justification *coram Deo*, before the late unhappy Rebellion, (at least all I have yet met with) such as Bishop *Jewel*, *Hooker*, *Reynolds*, *Whittaker*, *Davenant*, *Field*, *Downham*, *John White*, &c. do constantly prove, and vindicate the imputation of our blessed Saviours Righteousness against the contrary Doctrine of *Racovia* and *Rome*, *Papists* and *Socinians*. So that in Truth, it is only you, and some *Neotericks*, who (since the Year 1640.) deny such imputation, (*cum veritatis damno, & ecclesie scandalo*) to the prejudice of Truth, and the scandal of our Church and Religion. And though you are pleased to say; 'That neither the Homilies of our Church, nor Scripture, say any thing of such imputation: Yet I shall (in short) say a few things, which (if impartially consider'd) may possibly convince you of error, (in this particular) or abate your confidence in asserting it. And here consider,

1. What the Article of our Church says, ^b 'We are accounted Righteous before God, only for the Merits of Christ Jesus,

^b In our Articles, Art. 11.

Jesus, by Faith. 1. Here it is to be consider'd, that the word λογίζεσθαι, which occurs eleven times in one Chapter, (Rom. 4.) is (by the Latin Translators and Expositors) rendred sometimes by *imputare*, or *reputare*, or *adjudicare*, or *asimare*. And by our Church, & counted, & accounted, or & reckon'd. So that (in the Judgment of our Church) these three words are Synonymous, and signify the same thing in our English Idiom; that λογίζεσθαι in the Greek, or *imputare*, or *reputare* in the Latin. 2. By the Merits of Christ Jesus, (in the Article) His justice is understood; in that by his Meritorious Death and Passion, he satisfied his Fathers justice for us, and paid the full price of our Redemption. 3. When our Article says; That we are accounted Righteous before God; it is certain, that as God only *a* justifies, so it is he only, who counts, accounts, and reckons us Righteous, and *b* imputes (which word I omitted a little before) Christ's Righteousness to us, by which alone we can be justified *coram Deo*. 4. That the true sense then, and meaning of our Article is evidently this, God (who only justifies) imputes his Son's justice or Righteousness to us, (for whom only he perform'd it) and

d So our Engl. Version, Rom. 4. 3. 5. & Articulo. II. & Reckon'd, Rom. 4. 4. 9. 10.

f So our Hom. explains it, in the 1. pt. of the Sermon of Salvation. pa. 14.

a Rom. 8. 33. Rom. 4. 5. *b* Rom. 4. 6.

and for it, accounts or reckons us just before himself at his Tribunal. This imputing, or accounting our blessed Saviours Righteousness to Believing Christians for their justification, is fully expressed in our Homily of Salvation, (in the Conclusion of it) thus, ^c So that Christ is now the Righteousness, of all them who truly believe in him. He for them paid their Ransom, by his Death. He for them fulfilled the Law in his Life; So that in and by him, every true Christian may be called a fulfiller of the Law: For as much as what they lack'd, Christ's justice hath supplied. By the premises, I think it may be manifest, that Christ is ^d our Righteousness; that his Righteousness is ours; and so far ours, that his justice hath supplied the want of our Righteousness; and we are looked upon by our Gracious Father, (in and by Christ Jesus, and for his justice perform'd for us) as if we had perfectly fulfilled the Law; and so (by and for his Righteousness) we are (*coram Deo*) justified. Now it is manifest that this Righteousness of our blessed Saviour, and Surety cannot possibly be ours by infusion; (Men neither are, nor can be the subject of it) and therefore it must, of necessity, be ours by

^c Hom. of Salvation. pt. 1. p. 15.

^d And the Text expressly says, *Jer.* 23. 6. *1 Cor.* 1. 30.

by Imputation only ; God accepting it for us, and graciously imputing it to us.

2. And what our Church (and all Re-
form'd Churches) say concerning the
Imputation of our Blessed Saviours Right-
eousness, they have evident ground in
Scripture for it, and that in both the New
and Old Testament. This Righteous-
ness, (for of it St. Paul speaks) *e* Being
testified by the Law and the Prophets. That
this (which you unadvisedly deny) may
further appear, I consider. 1. That the
Righteousness we are speaking of, is that
which justifies (not *coram Hominibus*, but)
coram Deo. And 2. This Righteousness
may be Two-fold. 1. *Justitia Operum*,
a Righteousness Internal and Inherent in
the subject it justifies ; and is therefore
called our own Righteousness, being the
effect and product of our own works :
so the Holy Angels are, and Adam (while
he stood) was just. 2. *Justitia f Gratia*
& e impetrata ; which is External, and
not Inherent in the Subject it Denominates
and Constitutes Just. So we say, that
our Blessed Saviours Righteousness,
(though in him, and External to us) is
imputed to believing Sinners. And this
Imputed Righteousness, is (in Scripture)
call'd. 1. *Justitia f fidei* ; because Faith

e Rom. 3. 21.

f Rom. 3. 24.

e Rom. 4. 3,
4, 5, &c.

b Rom. 4. 13.

Rom. 9. 30,

32.

Rom. 10. 6.

is that which alone receives, and makes it ours. 2. It is usually call'd *Justitia Dei*; because God sent his Son to Lye for us, accepts his Sacrifice of himself, and the satisfaction given by it, and imputes it to us. So that by it, he is Reconciled to us, does not impute our sins to us, but (for his Son's Sacrifice and Satisfaction) absolves and justifies us. 3. It is called *Justitia Christi*; because it was wrought in, and by him, but for us. For all his obedience (Active and Passive) which as Man, and our Mediator, he perform'd, was to free us from sin, and the punishment of it. 'Twas for us, and our Salvation, he came down and Dyed. He was the Lamb of God, (*ἀγνός, qui tulit, pertulit, abstulit*) who has taken away our sins. He was (by his Fathers, and his own will and consent) made a Sacrifice for our sins; and did not only bear our sins, (*i. e. penam peccatis debitas*) but he put them away, (*Heb. 9. 28.*) And Abolish'd them, (*Heb. 9. 26.*) Purchased Reconciliation, and Peace with God, (*Col. 1. 20.*) which was presignified expressly in the Law, (*Levit. 16. 21, 22. 2 Chron. 29. 24.*) So that we have Redemption by his Blood, even the Remission of our sins. That is, by and for our Blessed Saviours

John 1. 12.

Rom. 3. 22, 25.

Rom. 1. 17.

Rom. 3. 22.

Rom. 10. 3.

Phil. 3. 9.

Rem. 4. 6.

2 Cor. 5. 19.

And so our

Homily. pt 2.

pag. 183. In

the 2 Sermon

of the passion.

He

was the

Lamb of God,

(*ἀγνός, qui tulit,*

pertulit, abstulit)

who has taken away

our sins. He was

(by his Fathers, and

his own will and consent)

made a Sa-

cristice for our sins;

and did not only

bear our sins, (*i. e. penam*

peccatis debitas)

but he put them away,

(*Heb. 9. 28.*)

And Abolish'd them,

(*Heb. 9. 26.*)

Pur-

chased Reconciliation,

and Peace with God,

(*Col. 1. 20.*)

which was presignified ex-

pressly in the Law,

(*Levit. 16. 21, 22.*

2 Chron. 29. 24.)

So that we have Redemp-

tion by his Blood, even the Remission

of

our sins. That is, by and for our Blessed

Saviours

Col. 1. 14.

Rom. 3. 24, 25.

Eph. 1. 7.

Saviours satisfaction, we are absolved from our Sins, and *coram Deo* justified. Our blessed Saviour (as the Apostle tells us) *humbled himself and became obedient unto Death, wherefore God hath highly exalted him; &c.* This obedience of Jesus Christ (so highly pleasing to his Father) was that Righteousness, which he perform'd himself, but for us, as our Surety, and Mediator. He had undertaken to pay our debt, by undergoing the punishment due to us, and he fully and justly paid it: and this his justice, being the justice of our Surety, and perform'd only for us, became ours, and we (by it) justified *coram Deo*. It being impossible that our just God should condemn, or require of us that debt, which our Surety and Saviour had fully paid. And for the further evidencing the imputation of our blessed Saviours Righteousness for our Justification; it is to be consider'd, 3. That he is call'd, *Our Righteousness*: Because his satisfaction given to his Father's Justice for our sins, (accepted of God, and imputed to us) is made our Righteousness, by which we are justify'd. Whence it is, that the Apostle says, *We are justify'd by his Blood. (not by works) And by Faith in his Blood, and through the*

Phil. 2. 8.

Jer. 23. 6.

Rom. 5. 9.

Rom. 3. 25.

Epist.

28 AUGUST

the
It
rec
by
ou
An
Ri
fur
you
him
ant
It
con
be
tho
ou
Sav
per
ven
put
Mo
4
Pou
Bou
Sup
thin
Sum
case
who
by

the d Redemption, which is in Jesus Christ. d Rom. 3. 24.

It is not any works, or inherent Righteousness in us; but his Righteousness, by and for which, we have Remission of our sins, and consequently Justification, And if you desire to know, how this Righteousness of our Blessed Saviour and surety, becomes ours? The Apostle tells you, it is God who makes it so. e Of e 1 Cor. 1. 30

him are ye in Christ, who of God, is made unto us, Wisdom, and Righteousness, &c. It is certain, and (by Learned Men) confess'd; that those words, *Amo Ous*, must be repeated *in xristo*, with every one of those words, *Σοφία ἀπὸ Θεοῦ*, and *δικαιοσύνη ὑπὸ Θεοῦ*, &c. The Righteousness of our Blessed Saviour was by him (as our surety) perform'd only for us, and by his Heavenly Father accepted, reckon'd, or Imputed to us, and is the only Cause and Motive for which he Justifies us.

4. If *Titius* owe you a Thousand Pounds upon Bond, and *Sempronius* be Bound with him, for the Payment of it. Suppose *Titius* be insolvent, having nothing, (or not near enough) to Pay that Sum, and be laid in Prison. If (in this case) *Sempronius* his Surety, pay that whole Sum, this payment, perform'd by his Surety, will, and (in Law and Justice)

Justice) must be imputed to *Titius*, and absolutely Free him from that debt and imprisonment : and (if he be brought before the Judge for non-payment of that Money) he must (for what his Surety has done for him) be (*coram judice*) absolved, and justified. We are all Sinners (the case, as to the Justice and Equity of it, is the same) and so become slaves to Sin, and in Captivity to Satan ; we have contracted a great debt, *debitum pene aeternae*, (which is impossible for us ever to pay.) Our blessed Saviour is our Surety, and pays our whole debt, and the full price of our Redemption, which being paid solely and only for us, (for our blessed Redeemer had no debt of his own to pay, save only as our Surety) this payment (though perform'd by another) is imputed to us ; so as we have the benefit of it ; and (being Freed from Sin and Punishment) are (*coram Deo*) justified. And (that you may see, how inconsiderately you say, that Scripture has nothing of our blessed Saviour's imputed Righteousness) I desire you to consider,

5. That the Evangelical Prophet *Isaiah* (speaking of our blessed Saviour, hath these words : *h* He (Jesus Christ) hath born

f Heb. 7. 22.

ἡμεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ

ὁμοῖον ἑαυτοῦ

ἡμεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁμοῖον

ἡμεῖς.

g 1 Pet. 1. 18.

19.

b Isa. 53. 4, 5,

o, 8.

born our grief, and carry'd our Sorrows ;
He was wounded for our Transgressions, and
bruised for our iniquities, the Chastizement
of our Peace was upon him, and with his
Stripes we are healed. And it follows,
The Lord hath laid upon him the Iniquity of
us all. And a little after, ¹ For the Trans- ¹ Ibid. verse 8.
gression of my People, was he stricken.
Where I shall only observe (what is
evidently in the Text) those four parti-
culars,

1. That God imputed our Sins to his
Son ; The Lord laid on him the iniquity
of us all. And it pleased the Lord to bruise
him, &c.

2. That they were imputed to him, *Non
quoad culpam, sed penam*. He was abso-
lutely innocent ; It was our iniquities, and
our transgressions. We only were the
sinful cause and subject of those Sins. The
Sins were only ours, and the punishment
and suffering for them, only his.

3. And as God imputed our Sins to our
blessed Saviour, *Quoad penam* ; so that
he suffered the punishment due to us, for
them ; So he imputeth our Saviours suf-
ferings and satisfaction to us, *Quoad bene-
ficium, & Justitiam* : So that by and for
his Sufferings and the Righteousness of
his satisfaction, we receive Absolution,

Remission of our Sins, and Justification. For so the Text tells us, *by his stripes we are healed.* Our Sins are Wounds and Sickneses of our Soul, and his Merits (apply'd by a Lively Faith) the only Plaister, and Physick which could cure them. It is not our works, or any inherent Righteousness which can cure, and justify us; but it must be a Righteousness imputed by God. *That man is blessed, or justified,* says the Apostle, *unto whom God*

a Rom. 4. 6. imputeth a Righteousness, without works: And that Righteousness which God thus imputes, is not, as I said, any inherent Righteousness of our works; but the Righteousness of his Son and our blessed

b Rom. 3. 24, Saviour, b Whom God hath set forth to be
25, 20. *a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, to declare his Righteousness, for the Remission of our Sins.* It is his imputed Righteousness, not any works of ours, for which we have Remission of our Sins, or

c 2 Cor. 5. 21. On which place, Justification before God. Sicut Christo, Iliodore Clarius (although a Papist) says
thus, Pro nobis inobedientia nostra sibi a Deo imputata, sup-
filium peccatumplacium, & pena; Ita nobis obedientia
fecit, id est Christi nobis imputata, Beneficium & justitia cessit. The Apostle expressly says the

efficeremur justis same thing, *c God hath made him (his*
tia Dei in eo. Son) to be Sin (i. e. A Sacrifice for Sin)
Hoc est, ut nos for us, who knew no Sin, that we might be
efficeremur justis made
apud Deum, per
ipsum Christum.

made the Righteousness of God in him. Our Sins were imputed to him, by God; that his Righteousness (which alone is called the Righteousness of God) might be made ours. Or you may take the meaning of this signal place; thus, *Sicut inobedientia & injustitia nostra, sunt in nobis solum subjective, tanquam in subiecto, & a nobis effective, tanquam a principio, (homo enim solus est peccati sui principium & subiectum) Christoq; sponsoi nostra solum imputantur ad penam, (penas enim nobis debitas, solus tulit, & a nobis in eternum abstulit) sic obedientia & justitia Christi erant in Christo solo subjective, tanquam in subiecto, & effective ab eo tanquam a principio; nobis tamen imputantur a Deo ad Justitiam.*

4. It follows (in that place of Isaiah) thus, *By his Knowledge shall my Righteous Servant justify many, for he shall bear their Iniquities.* 1. His Knowledge, (non effective aut subjective, *cujus Christus est Principium & subiectum*) Not that knowledge inherent in him, of which he is the subject and principle. But his knowledge objective, or the knowledge of him, of which he is the object, that is, our knowledge of him by a Lively Faith: which our blessed Saviour means, where he saith, *This is Eternal Life to know* ^{a Joh. 17. 3.}

and him whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ.

2. *My Righteous Servant*, There is in our blessed Saviour, a two-fold Righteousness.

1. *Justitia absoluta*; which is his Personal Righteousness, as the Son of God; whether by an Eternal or Temporal Generation: the first, his Righteousness as God; the second, as Man: For, as ^b Man, he was the Son of God, made under the Law, and by the Obligation of the Natural or Moral Law, bound to fulfil all the Righteousness required by that Law, and that for himself. 2. *Justitia Relativa*, his Righteousness, as he was our Surety; and so his Righteousness did consist, in exactly doing and suffering all those things his Father required, and he undertook to do and suffer for us, as our Surety.

And this is that Righteousness which is imputed to us, for our Justification, *coram Deo*. 3. When the Text says, *he shall bear our Iniquities*; the meaning is, he shall bear the punishment due to us, for our iniquities. So that the Prophet (in plain English) says thus, *My Righteous Servant, (or Surety for my People) shall by his knowledge (or a Lively Faith in him) Justify many, for he shall bear, and for them) suffer the punishment, otherwise due to them, for their Sins.* Where the suffer-

ings

^b Luke 1. 35.

ings and satisfaction of our blessed Saviour, which (as our Surety) he perfectly accomplish'd for us, are (by the Prophet) assigned for the only cause, and Meritorious Motive of our Justification. This granted, (as of necessity it must) I argue thus, That External Righteousness, for which alone, we are justified *coram Deo*, (must of necessity) be imputed to us, (for being external, and no way inherent in us, it cannot any other way affect us, so that we can have the benefit of it, save only by imputation) But the Righteousness of our blessed Saviour and Surety is an external Righteousness, for which alone we are justified *coram Deo*, ergo. It is and must be imputed to us, Q. E. D.

5. Lastly, Though you confidently say; 'That there is nothing in Scripture to prove that our blessed Saviours Righteousness is imputed to us, for our Justification; yet had you diligently read, and understood that one Chapter, and the few verses of it, here cited in the Margin, you would (or might) have found reason enough to have abated your great confidence, and rectify your dangerous mistake; and upon second thoughts I hope you will. In this place, the Apostle institutes a Collation, between Adam (the

c In your Letter p. 3. in the Postscript.

d Rom. 5. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19

e Rom. 5. 14.

f 1 Cor. 15,
45, &c.g Rom. 5. ubi
donum Gratia,
ver. 15. est
Remissio pec-
cati, ver. 16.
et justitia
Christi, ver. 17.h Obedience to
Death, even
the Death of
the Cross, Phil.
2. 8. which
was properly
the obedience of
Christ, as our
Surety and Me-
diator, per-
form'd not for
himself; but
only for us.

(the Type) and our blessed Saviour, (the Anti-Type) or between the first and second Adam, (as the Apostle elsewhere calls them). By the first, we have Sin and Condemnation; by the second (our blessed Saviour) Grace, and (the gift of Grace) Righteousness and Justification. The words of the Apostle, which (amongst others) may deserve your consideration; are these, *As by one offence, (or the offence of one, (of Adam) Judgment came upon all men to Condemnation: so by one Righteousness (or the Righteousness of one, of Jesus Christ) the free gift came upon all men unto Justification of Life.* And then it follows, *As by one mans disobedience, many were made Sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made Righteous.* Whence, I conceive it evident, that it is not our own works, or obedience, but the obedience and righteousness of our blessed Saviour, and Surety, performed only for us, (for that innocent Lamb having no Sins of his own, dyed only for ours) by which we are justified before God: And seeing this Righteousness and Obedience is extrinsecal to us, (our blessed Saviour being both the principle and subject of it) it can be no way ours, but only by Imputation. And hence it follows,

that

that we are justified before God, (by no inherent, but) only by our blessed Saviour's (and Suretie's) imputed Righteousness, *2. E. D.*

19. Again, when you had said, (but without any pretence of reason, (and manifestly against it) only said it) That ^{i In the post-script of your Letter.} 'neither the Scriptures nor Homilies say any one thing, for the imputation of our blessed Saviours Righteousness. You proceed (with the same confidence) and say, 'From whence, your Lordship e're 'this (I suppose) has corrected your mistake, when you told us; that imputing 'Christ's Righteousness, was Eleven times 'used in one Chapter, &c. *Rom. 4.* as 'Arminius himself granted. This I was 'then bold to deny, as well knowing the 'contrary. The same Candor (so you 'go on) may at once Pardon my boldness, and rectify your own error. It is 'not (say you) imputing Christ's Righteousness, but imputing Righteousness, 'that is there mention'd, which is the 'same that Pardon, and Justification, and 'this for the sake of Christ's Righteousness. These are your words.

Though what you here say, neither Answer, deserves, nor needs any answer, containing nothing, but your own unadvised and
extra-

extravagant sayings, without any pre-
tence of proof, or reason to confirm them :
Yet (for your sake, and better Informa-
tion) though you give no reason for what
you say ; I shall endeavour to give you
some, and (I hope) just reason, why you
should not say it. And here,

1. You condemn what I said as erro-
neous, for no other reason (in this your
Letter) save only because you say the
contrary ; which is very far from Lo-
gick or good Consequence. For certain-
ly my affirmation is no more false, be-
cause you deny it ; than any affirmation
of yours is untrue, if I deny it.

2. You say that I mistook, when I
told you ; that imputing Christ's Right-
eousness, was Eleven times used in one
Chapter, *Rom. 4.* This (you say) you
were bold to deny, as well knowing the
contrary. But 1. Your Memory fails
you, and you (not willingly, I suppose)
mistake my words, (as formerly you have
done) I said not, (as you say, I did)
that the imputation of Christ's Righte-
ousness, was Eleven times used in that
Chapter : But that the word *λογίζομαι*,
(which signifies to impute) was by St.
Paul, in that Chapter, (and in the mat-
ter of Justification) used Eleven times.

And

And this is evident, (at least, may be so) to any who will read that Chapter, and can tell Eleven. For there we have ^k Rom. 4. v. 4. ^l *μὴδὲ λογίζεται*, ^l and ^l *δικαιοσύνη λογίζεται*, and ^l v. 6. ^l *11.* ^m *μαρτία ἔ λογίζεται*, and ⁿ *πίστις λογίζεται*, occurs ^m ver. 8.

Seven times in that Chapter. 2. But ⁿ ver. 5. 3, 9, 10, 22, 23, 24.

(you say) you were bold to deny this, (you do indeed boldly deny our blessed Saviours imputed Righteousness) as well knowing the contrary. Here 1. For your knowledge you mention; 'That you well know the contrary; pardon my Infidelity, if I believe you not. For though your knowledge (in your own opinion) may be great, yet 'tis impossible you should know that to be true, (that our blessed Saviours Righteousness is not imputed to us, in our Justification) which contradicts express Scripture, and the sense of our own, and all Reform'd Churches: As by what already is, and shall anon be said, will (I hope) appear.

2. That you boldly deny it, I must confess and am (for your sake) sorry for it: And so should you too, did you consider, how little reason you have for such boldness, or denial. Nay what danger your Soul and Salvation is in, by this your bold denial of our blessed Saviours imputed Righteousness. For if (your Mother) the

o Hom. of Sal-
vation, pt. 2. p.
16, 17. confer.
Ibid p. 14. That
we are justified
by the justice,
s. c. By the sa-
tisfaction of
Christ, given to
God by the sa-
crifice of his
body and blood,
&c. Now 'tis
certain, this
justice can be
no way ours,
(being extrinse-
cal to us) save
by imputation
only, as it was
(by our blessed
Saviour and
Surety) per-
form'd only for
us.

the Church of England, may be believed,
He who denies this, is not to be account-
ed a Christian Man, nor for a Setter forth
of Christ's Glory; but for an Adversary
to Christ and his Gospel. These are the
words of our Church, in her Homily,
which (it seems) either you have not
read, or not understood, or forgot: For
I am unwilling to think, that you would
knowingly contradict the Doctrine ap-
proved by our Church, and by you sub-
scribed. But enough of this: For (I
hope) the reasons above given, and some
which follow (which to me are cogent)
may be (to you) significant; to prove
the imputation of our blessed Saviours
Righteousness, and the necessity of it, for
the Justification of any Sinner, *coram*
Deo.

3. But you say, 'That I may Pardon
'your boldness, and rectify my own
'Error, in saying that Christ's Righte-
'ousness is imputed to us. For (say you)
'it is not imputing of Christ's Righteous-
'ness, (which St. Paul speaks of *Rom. 4.*)
'but imputing Righteousness; which
'(say you) is the same with Pardon or
'Justification, and this for the sake of
'Christ's Righteousness. Here 1. I do
pardon your boldness, though it be (with-
out

out
grea
whi
(by
I ha
me,
deni
tend
your
fully
ful t
I w
possi
you,
nally
the
who
er
whi
God
ons
God
Righ
eithe
vale
of S
or I
self)
and
4. M

out any reason or ground) exceeding great. 2. For correcting my error, (of which you accuse me) when you shall (by any just reason) make it appear that I have err'd, and discover the Truth to me, which (as you mis-conceive) I have denied, (for you do not so much as pretend to any reason for what you say, in your Letter) I shall (God willing) cheerfully retract that error, and be very thankful to you for the discovery; but because I well know, that such discovery is impossible; I shall no more expect it from you, than (that which no man can rationally expect) impossibilities. 3. You are the first Man that ever I yet met with, who affirmed, that Remission of Sins or Justification is the Righteousness, which St. Paul (in this Chapter) says God imputes. Sure I am these Propositions [Pardon of Sin is the Righteousness God imputes: Or, Justification is that Righteousness] never occur in Scripture, either in express Terms, or Words equivalent; nor have I ever seen any Expositor of St. Paul, (Ancient or Modern, Greek or Latin, or any Divine (beside yourself) who has put such an Interpretation and Gloss upon the Apostles words. 4. Nor indeed is your Novel Gloss capable

ble of any good Sense. For you say,
 1. That Justification and the Righteous-
 ness God imputes to us, are the same
 thing. 2. You say, (and endeavour to
 prove) that Justification is the Act of
 God; and then the meaning of your
 Gloss must be this: The Act of God our
 Judge justifying us, must be the Justice
 or Righteousness imputed to us, for
 which he does justify and repute us Right-
 teous. Whereas the Act of God justifying
 us, necessarily pre-supposes that im-
 puted Righteousness for which he does
 justify us. 5. Faith is neither pardon of
 Sins, nor Justification; and yet the A-
 postle (in this Chapter) says no less
 than 7 or 8 times, that Faith is imputed
 for Righteousness. And ergo the Righte-
 ousness which Paul says is imputed, is
 not, cannot be the same with Pardon
 or Justification. 6. The Pardon of our
 Sins, is not (as you phantasie, with great
 error and confidence) the Righteousness,
 which St. Paul says is imputed; but the
 Righteousness of our blessed Saviour (and
 Surety) which is the only cause, and
 meritorious motive, for which we have
 Pardon, & God hath set forth his Son, to
 be a Propitiation, through Faith, in his
 Blood, to declare his Righteousness, for the
 Remission

p Rom. 4.
 ver. 3, 5, 9,
 10, 22, 23, 24.

q Rom. 3. 25.

Remission of Sins. The Righteousness, which St. Paul says is imputed, is not (as you mistake) the same with Pardon of Sin; but it is (as the Text expressly assures us) the cause of such Pardon, and so quite another thing. It is (saith the Text) *his Righteousness for the Remission of our Sins.* The Righteousness of our blessed Saviours sufferings and satisfaction, was therefore imputed, that (for it) our Sins might be remitted. It is only his Righteousness imputed, for which our Sins are pardon'd, and not ^r imputed. ^{r 2 Cor. 5. 19.} And this Truth (if that be possible) is ^{God was in} more fully express'd (by the same Apo- ^{Christ, reconciling the World,} ^{Not imputing} ^{their Trespases.} ^{Col. 1. 14.} *stle) elsewhere, In whom (in Jesus Christ) we have Redemption, through his Blood, even the forgiveness of our Sins.*

The Pardon of our Sins is not the Righteousness imputed, (St. Paul speaks of) but the Righteousness of his Redemption perform'd for us, and (by his Father) accepted for, and imputed to us. And to the same purpose a little after, ^{And} ^{Col 1. 20,} ^{21, 22.} *having made Peace through the Blood of his Cross, and reconciled us in the body of his Flesh through Death, to present us Holy, Unblamable, and Unreprovable in his sight.* Hence I argue thus, That Righteousness by which our Peace and Reconciliation

L

with

with God is made, and we presented Holy, and unblamable in his sight. I say, That's the Righteousness, which St. Paul says is imputed to us, and for which we are Justified. But the Righteousness of our blessed Saviours Death and Passion only does this, *ergo*. It only is that imputed Righteousness which, does justify *coram Deo* in his sight, *Q. E. D.*

4. And hence you may see how inconsiderately you write, when you say; 'That it is not Christ's Righteousness, (which the Apostle says is imputed) but 'Righteousness. That is, (as you say) 'Pardon of our Sins: And yet (in the very next words) you say; 'That our 'Sins are Pardon'd, for the sake of Christ's 'Righteousness. Where you evidently contradict your self, and confirm the Truth of what I have said, (and you in the very next preceding words deny'd) That it is Christ's Righteousness, for which, (or for the sake of which, as you express it) our Sins are pardon'd; and therefore, it is Christ's Righteousness, which is imputed. For certainly that external Righteousness for which, (or the sake of which) our Sins are pardon'd, cannot any other way procure such Pardon, save only by imputation; God accepting

cepting his Sons (and our Sureties) Satisfaction for us, so as (by it imputed) we have Pardon of our Sins. Nor do you only contradict your self, but the approv'd and receiv'd Doctrine of the Church of England. Which (in our Liturgy, speaking of receiving the Sacred Elements in the Eucharist) tells you, and all her Sons, *That we are to receive them in Remembrance of his Meritorious Cross and Passion, whereby alone we obtain Remission of our Sins, &c.* You say, 'Christ's Righteousness is not imputed for Pardon of our Sins, or Justification, (which you say consists only in Remission of our Sins) And the Church of England says, *That we have Remission of our Sins only for the Meritorious Passion of our blessed Saviour.* And therefore the Righteousness of that Passion, and the Satisfaction given (by it) to his Fathers Justice for our Sins, (being external to us, and perform'd (by our Surety) only for us) must be imputed to us. It being impossible, that we should have remission of Sins by it, unless it were so imputed to us, as to procure that benefit (the remission of our Sins) for us. And because you are so Zealous for your good works, (and against our blessed Saviours righteousness) in the business of our Justification;

u In the Office for the Communion, and in the Exhortation immediately following the Prayer for the whole State of Christ's Church.

on ; It may possibly be worth your consideration, what I shall here add.

5. That the Apostle in many of his Epistles, especially in that to the ^w Romans, does fully treat of our Justification ^x before God : and expressly tells us, of ^y imputed righteousness without works ; and that ^z the righteousness of Faith, and ^a that Faith is imputed for righteousness. But neither here, nor any where else when the Justification of a Sinner (*ἐν ὁμολογίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ*) in the sight of God, is handled ; has he one Syllable of inherent righteousness, or the righteousness of works, or that our works are imputed for righteousness. But *πᾶν τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς*, even the best works of best Men Totally secluded from Justification before God. So that Abraham ^b (the Father of the faithful) and David ^c (a Man after God's own Heart) were not justified before God by any works, or inherent righteousness. So St. Paul himself (when he should appear at God's Tribunal) desires ^d to be found in Christ, not having his own righteousness, which is of the Law, (not his inherent righteousness of works) but that which is through the Faith of Christ ; the righteousness which is of God by Faith. (That is the Imputed righteousness of Christ,

^w Rom. chap.

3 4, 5, 6, &c.

^x Rom. 3. 20.

^y Rom. 4. 6.

^z Rom. 4. 13.

^a Rom. 4. 3, 5.

^b Rom. 4. 2, 3.

^c Rom. 4. 6, 7.

^d Phil. 3. 9.

Christ, given by God, and received by Faith) And elsewhere, and (if that be possible) more expressly to our purpose, in his Epistle to Titus,^e *After the kindness, and love of God our Saviour towards man appeared, not by works of Righteousness, which we have done, but according to his Mercy he Saved us, &c.* It was not any works, not their works of Righteousness (nor their most Righteous works) which did, nor could justify Paul or Titus : It was the Mercy and Merits of Christ, his sufferings and satisfaction for their Sins, accepted and imputed by God, and received by Faith, which they rely'd upon for justification.

Tit. 3. 4, 5, 6.

Ibid. ver. 7.

I know what little shifts some have made use of, to evade these places, and the force of the reason drawn from them : who would persuade us, that the Righteousness of the Law, in which St. Paul desires not to be found, is to be meant either, 1. Of the Mosaical Law (Ceremonial or Judicial) or 2. Of the Righteousness of the Moral Law performed by his own strength before his Conversion. 3. But not of his Obedience to the Moral Law by the help of grace after his Conversion. Seeing it is improbable he should account his Evangelical sincere obedience

Objection.

loss and dung, and desire not to be found in it ; seeing without such *Obedience* and *Holiness*, no man shall see the Lord.

g Heb. 12. 14. *g*
Answer.

h Phil. 3. and
ver. 1. ad 15.
exclusive.

i v. 4 5, 6, &c.

k Rom. 3. 1. 2.

l Phil. 3. 6.

m Phil. 3. 7, 8.

n Phil. 3. 9.

To this Objection, take a short, yet (I hope) a sufficient Answer. The Apostle in the former part of this *h* Chapter, gives an account of his Joy and Confidence, (and that Righteousness he rely'd on as the ground of it) which was not in the *i* privileges he had, as a Jew, (though *k* they were *k* great) as he was an *Hebrew* of *Hebrews*, and a *Pharisee*. 2. Nor was it his obedience to the *Jewish* Law, though *l* that was considerable. For he saith, *that as touching the Law he was blameless*, (*Quare, Sine Querla coram hominibus, non sine culpa coram Deo.*) All these he rejects, as loss *m* and dung ; and renounceth *n* his own Righteousness, which is of the Law, and relays Solely on that Righteousness, which is of God by Faith. Now the *Quare* is ; what Law he means ; when he rejects his own Righteousness, which is of the Law ? And that he does not mean the Mosaical, or Ceremonial Law only, seems manifest,

1. Because the Law never was the Rule and measure of the Righteousness, by which Men were to be judged, and receive the sentence of Justification, or

Con-

Condemnation; But (as St. James tells us) it is (*lex Libertatis, lex Regia*) the Moral Law, which is the Rule and Measure of Righteousness, by which we (both *Jews* and *Gentiles*) must be judged, justified or Condemned. For 1. As it is impossible there should be any Sin, which is not a Transgression of the Moral Law, either immediately, or *mediate lege positiva*: (for the breach of any positive Law of God, or any just Law, or Command of Man, is evidently a Transgression of the Law of Nature, which requires obedience to such Laws and Commands) So, 2. It is impossible there should be any obedience to any just Law; which is not also an Observation of the Moral Law, which enjoynes and requires such obedience. Hence it is, that this Moral Law, is the only adequate Rule and Measure of all Humane Actions; of their Rectitude and Moral Obliquity; according to which, we must be judged at God's Tribunal, and receive the Sentence of Justification, or Condemnation.

2. When St. Paul writ this Epistle to the *Philippians*, (as likewise that to *Titus*) he neither had, nor could have, any Righteousness of his own, which was of, or

o He writ both
these Epistles
from Rome, (as
is certain) and
he came not
thither till the
Year 58, which
was (at least)
22 years after
our blessed Sa-
viours Death,
and the abro-
gation of the
Mosaical Law.

p Tit. 2. 14.
Christ by his
death redeem-
ed us from all
iniquity.
q Tit. 3. 5.

by the Mosaical or Ceremonial Law; because there was no such Law in the World, then (when he writ) to be Righteous by: That whole Law being abrogated and abolish'd at the Death of our blessed Saviour 20 or 30 Years before. I am absent from my Books, and cannot tell you the precise number of the Years; but sure I am, that he writ this Epistle to the *Philippians*, and that to *Titus* too, above 20 Years after our blessed Saviours Death, and so, long enough after the abrogation of the Mosaical Law.) And *ergo*. when he rejects his own Righteousness, which is of the Law, the Moral Law he must mean, there being no other Law then (the Mosaical being abolish'd) in relation to which, he could be righteous.

3. And this is more evident from that place of *Titus* (before cited) where he says, 1. In the Affirmative: that we are justified by the grace of Christ. 2. In the Negative: It is not our good works, by which we are justified, for so he expressly says, 9. Not by works of Righteousness, which we have done. He rejects all, (even the righteous works) of *Titus* and his own. Now (to say no more of the Law, to which *St. Paul's* righteous-
ness

ness did relate) 'tis evident, that *Titus* his righteousness here rejected from his justification, neither did, nor possibly could relate to any, save the Moral Law. The reason is ; because *Titus* was no Jew, (*nec Gente, nec Religione*) neither by Birth, nor as a Profelyte, but an uncircumcised Gentile : and therefore never was under the Mosaical Law, nor ought any obedience to it. And therefore the works of righteousness, which he had done, (and *St. Paul* rejects from his justification) must of necessity relate only to the Moral Law. Whence it evidently follows ; that the works of righteousness (even the best works of *Paul* and *Titus*, (two eminent Saints and Servants of Christ,) are secluded (by the Apostle) from having any hand in their justification. It was only the righteousness of Christ by Faith, they rely'd on, for justification *coram Deo*. And therefore if you dare (as it seems you do, though they durst not) rely upon your own good works for justification in God's sight ; unless your Piety be larger than theirs, (as I fear, (and I believe your Modesty will confess) it is not) your confidence (and imprudence too) is very great.

Gal. 3. 2.

Acts 9. 4. 5.
Phil. 3. 6.

" Feb. 11. 6.
So our 11. Arti.
we can do no-
thing (says our
Church) plea-
sing to God be-
fore Grace, &c.

4. So then, I think it manifest, that when St. *Paul* rejects his own righteousness, which is of the Law; he means the Moral Law. And then if we consider *Paul* before his Conversion; 'tis evident he had no inherent righteousness of his own, in relation to any Law, (Mosaical or Moral) being a violent and impious persecutor of Jesus Christ, and his Church. And indeed he himself has told us; that no Man (before his Conversion, and a Lively Faith) either has, or can have any good works, or works of righteousness, (as he calls them) nor can do any works pleasing to God. And therefore, when St. *Paul* says; He desires to be found in Christ, not having his own righteousness, which is of the Law: To say, (as some do) that he means his righteousness acquired by his Natural Abilities before his Conversion; is evidently irrational. Seeing St. *Paul* well knew (and has taught the World that Truth) that he neither had, nor (before his Conversion) could have so much as one good work, much less a righteousness in relation to the Moral Law.

5. After his Conversion, he had indeed an inherent righteousness of his own, arising from his good works, the fruits of Faith,

Fai-
tion
3. 1
and
as I
&c.
una-
and
spea-
Yet
him
and
mar-
pro-
of
of a
tion
whi-
non
whi-
was
10. 3
of wo-
1. R
Whe-
fide-
Go-
fary
nes-
the
nor

Faith, or a Righteousness of Sanctification; an imperfect Righteousness (Phil. 3. 12, 13, 14.) mix'd with Sinful failings and infirmities, even in St. Paul himself;

as he sadly complains, (Rom. 7. 14, 15, &c.) For though Socinus, and some, who

unadvisedly follow him, think otherwise,

and would have him (by a *Prosopopoeia*)

speak of some other Person, not himself:

Yet ⁱⁿ St. Augustine and the Fathers before

him, the ⁱⁿ Church of England, *Hooker*,

and (till of late) all her Learned Sons;

many Learned Papists say, and firmly

prove, that St. Paul in that place speaks

of ^{himself}, and not (by a *Prosopopoeia*)

of any other person) And the (afore men-

tioned) Righteousness of Sanctification,

which St. Paul had, (for other he had

none) is that inherent Righteousness,

which he calls his ^{own}; and though it

was an effect of Grace and the Spirit of

God, required by the Gospel, and neces-

sary to Salvation, and such a Righteous-

ness as he would not have wanted for all

the world: yet he did not confide in it,

nor rely upon it for his justification *coram*

in Augustin: contra Julianum, lib. 5. cap. 11. where he expounds, Rom. 7. 14, 15, &c. of St. Paul himself, and then adds, sic intellexit Hilarius, Gregorius, Ambrosius, & Cateri ecclesiae noti sanctique doctores, &c.
x In the 2^d pt. of the Hom. of Alms, Deeds, Homiliarum, pt. 2. p. 162.
y Hooker in his Treatise of Justification, S. 8.
z Bellarmine: De Justificat. lib. 4. cap. 14. Estus in Rom. 7. 14. where he fully proves, and vindicates the opinion, that S. Paul spoke of himself
What he here calls his own, Rom. 10. 3. He calls the same δικαιοσύνην By both which phrases, Righteousness of works, or inherent righteousness is meant, which is our proper righteousness.
1. Ratione principii, it is wrought by us. 2. Ratione subiecti, it is in us; Whereas, that Righteousness be relied upon, was iustitia Dei & Christi, per fidem, An external imputed Righteousness.

Deo; but only on the Righteousness of God through Faith in Christ, which, to be sure, was not any righteousness of his own works.

6. And when it is objected; that St. Paul would not (nor truly could) call that his own inherent Righteousness, (or Evangelical Obedience) *ἐνδύας ὡς σκύβαλα*, Loss and Dung. The Answer is easy, and evident, For, 1. That his own Righteousness (of which he speaks) consider'd absolutely, and in it self, neither truly could, nor was (by him) so called: But, 2. As the Greek Scholiasts observe, (and 'tis evident by the Text) he counts those things he speaks of, (loss and dung, *κατὰ οὐρανίου*, and comparatively; in relation and comparison with our blessed Saviour and his righteousness, *b* What things (saith he) were gain to me, I counted loss for Christ, and for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ, *c*. Though the things (he speaks of) were in themselves good, and gain to him, (as he confesseth) yet compared with the excellency of Jesus Christ, and his righteousness, he accounted them, *ἐνδύας ὡς σκύβαλα* as loss, and vile things to be cast to dogs. And that you may see, 'tis usual in Scripture, to undervalue things in themselves

excel.

excellent, in relation to, and in comparison with things more excellent; the same Apostle, elsewhere, *d* speaking of the *d 2 Cor. 3. 10.* Ministrations of the Law and the Gospel, saith; that they were both (*ἐν δόξῃ*) glorious, (consider'd absolutely and in themselves) yet he adds, (considering them *κατὰ σύγκρισιν*, and comparatively) That even that which was made glorious had no glory, in this respect, by reason of the glory which excelleth. Glorious it was in it self, and consider'd so; but (in comparison with the Gospel) he says, it had no glory. So elsewhere he calls the Mosaical Laws, (though Sacred and Divine institutions) *ἀδυνάτοι καὶ ὀλίγοι*, *e weak* Gal. 4. 9. *and beggarly Elements, if compared with the Gospel.* And (on the same account) *f* *Isaiah* confessing his own, and his peoples Sins) says, *f* *All our Righteousnesses are as filthy Rags.* *f* *Isa. 45. 6.* So he calls even his own inherent righteousness, if compared with the absolute and perfect righteousness of Christ, by which all his Saints are justified. For this righteousness of our blessed Saviour imputed to his Saints is (in Scripture) call'd a compleat and intire *Lin- 2 Rev. 19. 8.* *men Garment, White and Clean, which they have of* *h* *Christ, to cover their Nakedness,* *h* *Rev. 3. 18.* *(it is not an inherent, but an* *& 6. 11.* *imputed*

i Rom. 4. 7.

k Rev. 1. 5.

Rev. 7. v. 14.

* When S. Joh.
says, imputed
Righteousness,

is a linnen Robe, white and clean. And Isaiah says, our inherent Righteousness, is filthy Rags, the Analogy and difference between them, appears thus,

1. Imputed Righteousness is an intire Robe; inherent, Rags only.
2. Imputed Righteousness is perfectly white and clean; but our inherent Righteousness, or Rags, are filthy. Either, 1. In respect of their defects, which stains them. 2. Or (at least) comparatively, in relation to the more excellent Righteousness of Christ.

is an intire Robe, or Linnen Garment, (as the Apostle calls it) White and Clean, which covers all our Sins, and Moral Nakedness: But our own inherent righteousness, is but Rags, or broken Fragments, (as it were) and little pieces of Righteousness, and no intire Robe. For our many intervening Sins, divide and rent it into rags. 2. And those rags too, are not perfectly White, and Clean; for if God should examine them, *vel dignetur*, according to the exact Severity of the Moral Law; they would be found defective,

fective^l, (at least) in degree, and unable to abide the Trial, so as to justify us *coram Deo*. 2. But although this be an approved, an evident, and sufficient Answer to this objection; yet the Text affords us another. For when he says, *I count all things but loss for Christ, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, &c* By those words, no more can rationally be meant, than this, that he counted all those things but dung, the loss of which he had suffered, or which he had lost for Christ. Which can relate only to the things he had before mentioned. (*ver. 4, 5, 6, 7.*) And not to his own Evangelical righteousness, which follows. (*ver. 9.*) for that he neither had, nor (without Sin) could lose. Or thus, I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them (*i. e.* All those things I have lost for Christ, (amongst which his own Evangelical righteousness could not be reckon'd) and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having my own inherent righteousness, (his meaning is not, that he desired to want or lose it, (for he could not possibly be in him (in Christ) without it) but he desired not to have it, to that end and purpose, to trust in it, and rely upon it, for his justification before

See Hooker in his Treatise of justification, at the end of his Eccles. Policy. I have not the Book here, and so cannot cite the S. but there he says; that no one action of any man (our blessed Saviour excepted) since the fall of Adam, if it were examined according to the exact severity and rigor of the Moral Law, would be found (without any defect) absolutely perfect: This he says, in these, or words to the same purpose.

fore God) but that which is through the Faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by Faith. This is that righteousness, on which he only relied, and desired to be found in Christ, whose it was, and from whom alone he could have it. In short; it was the righteousness,

m He was our
Righteousness,
Jer. 23. 6.
1 Cor. 1. 30.
n Rom. 3. 24.
25.
o Rom. 21. 22.
Rom. 10. 3.
Rom. 1. 17.
p Rom. 4. 6.
q Rom. 4. 13.
r Righteousness
to be sought by
Faith, by which
only we can
have the bene-
fit of it.
Jer. 3. 16.
Rom. 9. 31, 32.
s Isa. 63. 3.
t Gal. 3. 13.
u Rom. 4. 13.
Rom. 9. 30.

1. Of our blessed *m* Saviour *n* suffering and satisfying for our Sins. 2. The righteousness of God, accepting it for us, and *p* imputing it to us. 3. And the righteousness of *q* Faith, receiving and only applying it, so that it becomes ours, and we come to have the *r* benefit of it. It is one, and the very same righteousness, which usually (in Scripture) has all these Appellations. 1. *Justitia Christi, qui legem pro nobis Solus prestitit, & a Maledictione s Solus redemit.* 2. *Justitia Dei, qui obedientiam filij (Loco & Vice nostrâ prestitam) acceptat, & nobis imputat.* 3. *Justitia Fidei, u quia fides sola applicat.*

20. Again, when here in your Letter (in the Postscript of it) you do confidently deny our blessed Saviours righteousness to be imputed to us; you contradict yourself, and a great Truth, which you had before acknowledged. For you truly said before (in the beginning of your *w* Letter) what you have forgot, or not consider'd in

w In the 1. p.
of your Letter.

in the end of it.) ' That our blessed Sa-
'viours Blood, his Satisfaction, and righ-
'teousness (they are your own words)
'are the only Meritorious cause of our
'justification. Now he who says this,
and yet denies the imputation of Christ's
Righteousness (as you do) does evidently
contradict himself. For the Righteous-
ness of our Saviours Satisfaction, neither
is, nor can be ours, (or the Meritorious
cause of our justification) any other way,
save only by imputation: And *ergo*, who
ever grant Christ's Righteousness and Sa-
tisfaction for us; do (with the same
Breath) grant the imputation of it to us.
And whoever denies such imputation,
does (by undeniable consequence) deny
such satisfaction. That this may fur-
ther appear, consider with me,

1. That the Law of Nature (or the
Moral Law) obliges us. 1. And immedi-
ately: *ad obedientiam*. 2. And then (Sin
pre-supposed) *ad penam*. So that by the
obligation of this Law, we and all men)
are involv'd in a double debt. 1, *Debitum*
obedientiae perfectae ac perpetuae, (for this
Natural, or Moral Law, and the obliga-
tion of it, is Eternal and Immutable, and
binds as well since, as before the Fall)
This debt *Adam* did not, and since his
M Eall,

Fall, none could Pay. For the whole
 a Rom. 3. 19. World being guilty : before God, an impossibility came upon us, to pay this debt.
 2. *Debitum pene* : For (Sin pre-supposed) punishment became our debt, which God our just Judge might require of us : and this such a debt, as we might lye under for ever, but could never fully satisfy and pay.

y Heb. 9. 15. 2. Our blessed Saviour (as our Me-
 i Joh. 2. 1. 2. diator and Surety) undertook for us, to
 z Heb. 7. 22. pay this debt, made himself a Sacrifice
 a Heb. 9. 14. for our Sins, and his Father (he having
 b Heb. 10. 17. willingly b undertaken it) exacted this
 c Isa. 53. 5, 6, 8. debt of him ; *Laid upon him the iniquities of us all, wounded, and bruised him for our Sins.* And our blessed Saviour by
 d Heb. 9. 14. this his Meritorious d Sacrifice of himself, satisfy'd his Fathers Justice for us, and
 e Isa. 53. 11. (by, and for that satisfaction) justified
 f 2 Cor. 5. 19. us. *God was in Christ* (says the Apostle) *reconciling the World to himself*, not imputing their Trespases, &c. For as to
 g Levit. 17. 1. impute Sin, is to condemn and punish ;
 h Rom. 4. 8. So b not to impute, is to absolve and justify.

3. Now this Meritorious Suffering of Christ, undergone for us, in i obedience to his Fathers Will, is called (and indeed is) his Justice and Righteousness : as (according

i Phil. 2. 8.
 Heb. 5. 8.

of Justification.

171

According to the Church & of England) you truly acknowledge. I say, His Justice.

Hom. of Salvation. pt. 1. p. 14.

1. Not the justice of the Deity, that was not capable of any, especially passive obedience.

In your Letter p. 1.

2. Nor the justice of his Humanity, or of Christ, as Man, absolutely consider'd; for (as such) being perfectly innocent, no Law did, or could require passive and penal obedience in him.

3. But it was the Righteousness of our blessed Saviour, as our Surety and Mediator.

For although as Man, and a Rational Creature, he was under the Law, (*quoad obedientiam activam*) and the obligation to perform it, indispensable and necessary:

Yet (*Quoad obedientiam passivam*) his being under the Law was not necessary, but purely Voluntary.

He humbled himself, and willingly laid down his Life for his Sheep, took their debt upon him, and fully paid it with his precious Blood.

m Phil. 2. 8.

So that by the premises, I believe it may appear, that the sufferings and satisfaction of our blessed Saviour was the Righteousness of our Mediator and Surety, perform'd by him, but for us and our Redemption and Justification.

n Joh. 10. 17, 18.

4. And as it was perform'd by him for us; So it was by his Father imputed to us;

1 Cor. 6. 20.

We are bought with a price, &c. that price the blood of our blessed Saviour.

1 pet. 1. 18,

19.

us ; So that we had the benefit of it. He
p Isa. 53. 5. was wounded and bruised, &c. And we
q Ibid. v. 11. were healed and justified by it. We were
r Rom. 5. 10. reconciled to God by his Death, and justi-
f Rom. 5. 9. fied by his Blood, &c.

The premises impartially consider'd ;
 I hope you will, (and I am sure you may)
 see some reason to believe, that he, who
 grants (as you do) the Righteousness of
 our blessed Saviours satisfaction by him
 (as our Surety) perform'd for us ; must
 (by undeniable consequence) grant, un-
 less he will contradict himself, (as you
 do in denying it) the imputation of it
 to us for our justification *coram Deo*.

2. E. D.

t Once more.
That the Gos-
p:l-Righteouf-
ness is not in-
ternal and in-

herent ; but external and imputed, appears by the expressions of it in Scrip-
 ture. 1. It is a Wedding Garment (Mat. 22. 12.) 2. A Robe or White
 Raiment (Rev. 19. 8.) 3. And this we must have of Christ, to cover our
 Sin, or Moral Nakedness. (Rev. 3. 18.) 4. And this Garment, which
 is (as St. John says) White and Clean ; has its purity, from our blessed Sa-
 viours Blood. (Rev. 7. 14. Rev. 1. 5.) The Saints had washed their Robes,
 and made them White in the Blood of the Lamb. 5. And they whose Robes
 are not thus washed (who have not this imputed Righteousness) have no part
 in Christ, (John 12. 8.) Their good works will not do it. 6. Hence we are
 said to put on Christ ; (that is, this Robe of his Righteousness.) Which Ju-
 dicious Hooker expresses thus. Faith is the only hand, which putteth on
 Christ unto Justification, and Christ the only Garment, which being put on,
 hides the imperfection of our works, and makes us Blameless in the sight of God,
 &c. Hooker in his Treatise of Justification. Sect. 31. At the end of his
 Eccles. Policy. p. 258. Edit. London, 1662. He knew no Justification
 by works then ; nor (pretend what you will) do you now.

But enough of this ; indeed more (had
 not you been an instance to the contrary)
 than

than I could ever have thought needful, to perswade a Son and Divine of the Church of *England* to believe that Doctrine, which he had solemnly subscribed. However (though my Busineses have been many, and my Infirmities more, (having for many weeks, been confined to Physick and my Chamber) yet out of Love to Truth, and Charity to you; and in discharge of that Duty, which (by my Place and Calling) I owe to all my Brethren to indeavour (as much as in me lies) to incourage and keep them in the way of Truth, and in the belief of the Doctrine of our Church; or otherwise, if they err, (as I believe and know you do) by Admonitions, Instructions, or (*quod nollem*) by Censures to reduce them to their Duty.) I say, upon these considerations, I have taken the pains to write and send these Papers, to undeceive you, to shew you your errors, and the danger of them. And in order hereunto, I shall (as in Prudence and Conscience I am bound) deal impartially and truly with you; and propose some few things more to your Serious Consideration, both concerning the matter of your Epistle, and the manner and way of Writing it: Which may more concern you, than

(may

(may be) at present, you are aware of. And here,

1. For the Calumnies and Reproaches you liberally cast upon me, for your accusing, arraigning, and (*causa iniqua & inaudita*) condemning me, of (I know not how) many and great Errors: I desire to know of you, what Reason or Religion allows you, thus to Calumniate and Censure your Superior; as you confess I am; and (if you continue those your Errors and Calumnies) may hereafter (for other reasons) find it true. However, What is past I freely Pardon; though you neither desire, nor (till you confess your Crime) deserve it. 2. For your strange confidence, (such as I never yet met with in any sober Writer) in affirming and denying what you please Magisterially, (always without just, and mostly without any pretence of proof) It would not be amiss for you to consider that Advice, which (if I forget not) *Archidamus* anciently gave to one of your Confidence, *Aut viribus adde, aut animis deme*, either use less confidence, or (to support and justify it) bring more cogent reasons, and better consequence.

3. As to the matter and substance of your Discourse, (which is to prove justification

fication by our own works, and inherent Righteousness) it contains, 1. Many of your own bold and confident assertions, (*non Argumenta sed dictata*) without any reason, or pretence of Proof to establish them. 2. When you do pretend to reason, and for the proof of your Positions, being Arguments, which you say, (and may be, believe) are unanswerable; they seem to me (for reasons before given) Inconsistent or Impertinent, and your Expositions of that place in St. James, of our Articles and Homilies (which you, in vain, endeavour to expound so, as to agree with your Novel and erroneous Hypothesis) are manifest mistakes. So that if your knowledge of other parts of Divinity be no better than what you have of Justification, (as appears by your Letter) I neither do, nor can think you worthy of a Pastoral Charge, and Cure of Souls; nor fit to instruct others, till you be better instructed your self.

4. The Pains I have taken in these Papers was out of an unfeigned Love to Truth and You; that I might undeceive you, and (at least endeavour to) free you from error, by giving you my Reasons against, and answering yours for it. But yet, if there be any reason in your Letter,

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

which you think (as possibly you may) I have not answered; or if you have any other more concluding argument; if you will let me know it, I shall (with all Meekness and Sincerity) endeavour your further satisfaction. Only (if you have any such argument, and will communicate it) let it not be in a loose Discourse, but in a Logical Form, that I may more distinctly see the invalidity or strength of it; and you the sufficiency or insufficiency of my Answer.

5. In the mean time, seeing I believe (and know) that your Positions are erroneous contradictions to the Truth of Scripture, of our Articles, Homilies, and the known, and by you subscribed Doctrine of the Church of *England*. (Especially your asserting justification by our own works, and inherent Righteousness, and your denying the imputation of our blessed Saviours Righteousness in our justification *coram Deo*.) And least (by Preaching such Doctrine) you might seduce others, and so become doubly guilty, both of your own and your People's errors; I do hereby admonish you, (what ever you may think) not to Preach, or Publish such Doctrines; which (I am sure) you cannot do, *Sine veritatis dam-*

no, & ecclesie scandalo; nor (if our Canons and statutes were put in execution) without great danger and damage to your self. This Admonition I give you; and it will concern you (more may be, than you are well aware of) to observe it.

6. Lastly, you say (with your usual Objection. and ungrounded confidence, to give it no worse name) "That such admonition (as I now give you) proceeds not from a Spirit according to the Gospel: and that in an Age so cold in Charity, and void of good works; nothing can be more needful for us to Preach and Press, than St. James his Doctrine, (Chap. 2.) and how that can be done, without Preaching up good works, as conditions of our Justification, you are not able to imagine. So you.

u In your Letter p. 2. lineis ultimis; & p. 3. line 1.

In answer to this. 1. Whether my admonition, or your rash censure be more agreeable with the Spirit of the Gospel, I leave to you (upon second thoughts) to consider and Judge. 2. What the disability of your Imagination is, (save what I understand by your Letter) I know not. But if (after what is before said for your better information) you shall not be able to understand. St. James (many times urged by you and miserably mistaken)

Answer.

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

mistaken) in a better Sense, than that you pretend to, your disability (or wilfulness) will be exceeding great. 3. That this Age (as you truly say) is cold in Charity, and too void of good works, is, and must be confess'd; and therefore I willingly assent to what you add, 'That 'it is needful that we should diligently 'Preach and Press them to the People. But this is not enough: We ought also (which you omit) diligently to do good works our selves, as well as Preach them to others. We should by our Piety, Justice, Sanctity, and Civility, give good examples to the People, and our selves do all those good Duties we Preach to them: least while we press good deeds to others, and do bad ones our selves; our doings do more mischief, than our Doctrine good. We may, and should (in this) imitate *Cesar* (though a *Pagan*) in the Poet, *Ignave, venire te Cesar, non ire jubet*. He did not bid his Soldiers go and fight, while he stay'd behind: But he (giving them an example of Courage and Fortitude) bid them follow him, and do what he did: And you should (and I hope will) remember that of the Primitive Christians in *M. Felix*, *Non loquimur magna, sed vivimus*: They did not only

Tit. 2. 7.

Phil. 4. 9.

1 Tim. 4. 12.

Be thou an example of the Believers in Word, in Conversation, in Charity, in Spirit, in Faith, in Fidelity,

only talk, (an easie thing) but live like Christians; not only exhort others to do good works, but did them themselves; as you, and all of us should, and (I hope) will.

4. See then, as for your purpose to Preach up good works, I do highly approve it; there is a necessity that you, and every Faithful Minister, should do so.

But you must take heed, that you Preach them up, to those ends and purposes to which they are appointed: otherwise it may be (as in *Socinians* and *Papists* it is) a bad work in you to Preach up good ones. Good works (we say) are necessary.

1. *Necessitate praecepti*, the Eternal and Immutable Law of Nature indispensably requiring them of all Men. 2. *Necessitate meriti*;

it is to Holiness & Heaven is promised; nor can we obtain Salvation without it. Good works are the way, in which we are to walk towards Heaven.

But then you must remember, that good works are *via ad Gloriam, via Regni, licet non causa regnandi* *non ad Justitiam*. We are Created in Christ Jesus unto good works (says the Apostle) that we should walk in them. We must be New Creatures, Regenerate, Born again, and made the Sons of God by Faith, (which is the Spiritual Life by which the Just live)

x 1 Tim. 4. 8.

Heb. 12. 14.

z Eph. 2. 10.

^a *Disso. loca,*

Eph. 2. 10.

^b John 1. 12.

^c Heb. 10. 38.

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

d Art. Relig.
12. See the
Hom. of Fast-
ing, pt. 1. in
the 2 Tom of
our Homilies,
p. 81. 82.

e Tit. 3. 14.

f Phil. 4. 8.

1 Thess. 5. 22.

Tit. 3. 1.

Heb. 13. 29.

Col. 3. 10. 11.

Or.

live) before we can exercise the Operations of that Life by walking in good works, which are the effects of it. Good works (*in Adultis*) are *Media precedanea in Ordine ad Gloriam, non ad justitiam*: they necessarily precede our justification. Our Mother the Church of England (out of St. *Augustine*) tells us; 'That good works follow justification, and pre-suppose the Person Just; And so cannot possibly be *media* or *via ad justitiam*: For so they should be antecedent and precede that, which (of necessity) they do, and must follow. And hence it further (and evidently) follows; That if you Preach and Press good works, as *media & via ad justitiam*, as previous and antecedent means, or conditions of our justification *coram Deo*; you mistake your Text, (whatever it be) and contradict Truth, and the approved, received, and (by you) subscribed Doctrine of our Church. There are good ends, and necessary uses, for which good works ought carefully to be press'd and done, and none presseth them more / than St. *Paul*, and our Church from him. But our justification by them is none of those ends or uses; as may, and (I hope) will appear, by what is before said, as to this particular.

What

What these Papers (or the reasons given in them) may signify to you, I know not. Only if you read them without prejudice, and with the same sincerity and desire of Truth, wherewith I have writ them; they may possibly prove beneficial to you. Sure I am, it is my desire and hearty Prayer, that God Almighty would be Graciously pleased, so to bless and illuminate our understandings; that both You, and I may see, and assent to Truth, when we see it; and so to Sanctify our Wills and Affections, that we may embrace and love it. Let not your great and ungrounded confidence deceive you; for I can assure you that Wiser and Greater Men than I do believe and know, that you have incur'd the Censure of our Canon and statute, and that I might (without any further Witness or Evidence) excommunicate you, (or you being already *excommunicatus a lege*, I might declare that *de facto* you are excommunicate) seeing you have in your Letter, and under your Hand, made yourself *Consistentem reum*, and confess'd your self guilty of those errors, which by Law deserve; it and if I should execute that Sentence, you would not easily get it off. But it is your good (Spiritual and Temporal)

Bishop Barlow's First Letter

poral) which I really desire, and not your ruine, and *ergo*. if the reasons I have given you, prevail not so far, as to the altering of your Judgment, and renouncing your errors; yet if you obey my admonition, (which will concern you more than you are aware) and do not publickly indeavour to infect others, but keep them to your self, though it would be an affliction to me to see any of my Brethren espouse such errors, as really are, and one day will appear dangerous; I say, if you keep them to your self, I shall be so far from troubling you, that (if you have any occasion to use me) you shall find me willing, and (may be) able by my Authority and interest with my Friends, (which are neither few for number, nor for Quality, inconsiderable) to assist you in any thing, which may tend to your good. So that as at present (notwithstanding your great Provocations) I am; so for the future (unless you give just and further cause to the contrary) I shall be

London June
6. 1678.

Your Loving Friend,
and Brother,

Thomas Lincolne.

Mr.

Mr. J. W's.

Second *LETTER*

TO

Bishop Barlow.

My Lord,

YOUR's I Received, whereby I perceive your Lordship hath been much offended at my Letter, and I do also plainly see thereby, that you had just cause so to be. Now ere I proceed any further. I express my self concerning your, and my Writings, as followeth. As for your's, My Lord, that good and Christian Spirit which breaths through it, together with your Fatherly care to inform me of the Truth, and desire of my profit, and
the

the intermixture of so much Reading and Learning hath much wrought upon me to Love and Honour you, which I shall do unfeignedly, whilst I live. Though, My Lord, I hope, you will not be displeased, if I say, that now and then, there is some spice of Humane infirmity, (as what good man is without?) and some mistake of my meaning, perhaps sometimes occasion'd through my own ill wording of it.

As for my own, I do retract all that part of the Letter, wherein your Lordship judges your self to be by me reproached, accused, censured, and misrepresented. I can assure you, My Lord, that if this be *finis Scripti*, it never was *Scribentis*; and seeing your Lordship denies some words that I attribute to you; I will believe you rather than my own Memory. And though you have Pardon'd me already for it, yet I do most humbly desire your Pardon again, and do profess my hearty sorrow for it, and do beg it of God; and do also desire you to beg it of him for me. As for the Argumentative part of it, I do believe that it was not managed with so much Caution, Wisdom and Modesty, as became me towards you; call my management of it Impudence, Rashness

to *Bishop Barlow.*

185

Rashness, Vanity, Folly, Vain Confidence, Presumption, or what you please, I will take it Patiently, and I humbly beseech you to forgive it.

As for my impugning the Articles of the Church of *England*, and its Doctrine, I am not yet convinc'd of that; but whether I have or not, seeing your Lordship doth Judge that I have, and thereupon have incurr'd the Penalty of Excommunication, which you say, you freely remit. I do here also acknowledge your Goodness, and do promise that I will not spread any opinion, that shall thwart the Received Doctrine of our Church: and do submit to your admonition, rather of keeping my opinion as to my self, than of publishing them to the prejudice of Religion by Law establish'd.

My Lord, though you have found me too Confident, you shall not find me a Contumacious Person, but submissive to my Superiours, and particularly to your self, as I ought to be. But though I exceedingly value your Lordship's Learning and Judgment, yet can I not be satisfied with some of your Expositions of Scripture: Yet will I not contend with my Diocesan, nor make any reply, unless you enjoyn me. However because

N

your

the intermixture of so much Reading and Learning hath much wrought upon me to Love and Honour you, which I shall do unfeignedly, whilst I live. Though, My Lord, I hope, you will not be displeased, if I say, that now and then, there is some spice of Humane infirmity, (as what good man is without?) and some mistake of my meaning, perhaps sometimes occasion'd through my own ill wording of it.

As for my own, I do retract all that part of the Letter, wherein your Lordship judges your self to be by me reproached, accused, censured, and misrepresented. I can assure you, My Lord, that if this be *finis Scripti*, it never was *Scribentis*; and seeing your Lordship denies some words that I attribute to you; I will believe you rather than my own Memory. And though you have Pardon'd me already for it, yet I do most humbly desire your Pardon again, and do profess my hearty sorrow for it, and do beg it of God; and do also desire you to beg it of him for me. As for the Argumentative part of it, I do believe that it was not managed with so much Caution, Wisdom and Modesty, as became me towards you; call my management of it Impudence, Rashness

to *Bishop Barlow.*

185

Rashness, Vanity, Folly, Vain Confidence, Presumption, or what you please, I will take it Patiently, and I humbly beseech you to forgive it.

As for my impugning the Articles of the Church of *England*, and its Doctrine, I am not yet convinc'd of that; but whether I have or not, seeing your Lordship doth Judge that I have, and thereupon have incurr'd the Penalty of Excommunication, which you say, you freely remit. I do here also acknowledge your Goodness, and do promise that I will not spread any opinion, that shall thwart the Received Doctrine of our Church: and do submit to your admonition, rather of keeping my opinion as to my self, than of publishing them to the prejudice of Religion by Law establish'd.

My Lord, though you have found me too Confident, you shall not find me a Contumacious Person, but submissive to my Superiours, and particularly to your self, as I ought to be. But though I exceedingly value your Lordship's Learning and Judgment, yet can I not be satisfied with some of your Expositions of Scripture: Yet will I not contend with my Diocesan, nor make any reply, unless you enjoyn me. However because

N

your

Mr. J. W's. Second Letter

your Lordship hath given me leave to move my doubts to you in Logical Form, I will adventure a little now, not fearing that your Lordship will take any advantage of Law against me for it.

1. Qu. *An Sancti inharente justitiâ justificantur?* Aff.

Prob. *Fides est justitia inharens, sed Sancti fide justificantur. Ergo. Justitiâ inharente. Minor conceditur. Major probatur ex Rom. 4. 13.*

2. Qu. *An operando (& consequenter operibus) justificantur sancti?* Aff.

Qui fidendo justificantur, operando justificantur. Sed sancti fidendo justificantur. Ergo. Minor conceditur. Major probatur ex 2 Thess. 1. 11. & 1 Thess. 1. 3. Joan. 6. 29.

3. Qu. *An Justificatio Jacobina sit constitutiva, vel coram Deo; an declarativa vel coram Hominibus.* Aff. Prius. Neg. Post.

Ea justificatio quæ aliter exprimitur, adeoq; exponitur per Salvationem, imputationem ad justitiam, & Reconciliationem cum Deo, ea demum est justificatio constitutiva. Sed justificatio Jacobina, &c. Ergo.

Major probatur ex Rom. 4. per Totum. Item ex Homil. de salute vel Salvatione humani generis, &c. i. e. de justificatione uti exponitur

exponitur. Art. 11. Minor probatur ex Jacob. 2. 14, 23.

4. Qu. An justificatio Evangelica ponitur in Remissione peccatorum? Aff.

Ea justificatio, cujus natura explicatur per Remissionem peccatorum, ponitur in Remissione peccatorum. Sed Justificationis Evangelica natura (& forma) explicatur per Remissionem peccatorum. Ergo. Major, ni fallor, conceditur. Minor probatur ex Rom. 4. 2, 8. Ubi justificatio, imputatio ad justitiam, Remissio peccatorum & non-imputatio iniquitatis sunt idemverba.

Item ex Hom. Justif. parte 1. initio. Quisque autem ex necessitate constringitur ad querendam alteram justitiam sive justificationem ex Dei ipsius manibus accipiendam, scilicet, Remissionem suorum peccatorum & delictorum in quibuscunque deliquit. Parte 2d. sine fides viva nos a se abigit & remittit & dirigit (Angl. appointeth i. e. pointeth) nos ad Christum, ut ex illo solo Remissionem peccatorum nostrorum vel justificationem percipiamus.

5. Qu. An obedientiâ Christianâ justificamur? Aff.

Quæ obedientia divinitus nobis statuitur, ut exinde justitiam obtineamus, ea est justificatio. Sed obedientia Christiana, &c. Ergo.

Major conceditur. Minor probatur ex Rom. 6 16. Collat. cum 10. 10. Rom. 2. 13.

6. Qu. *An fides Justifica sit nuda fiducia misericordiae Divina? Neg.*

Ea fides, quae competit improbis, non est fides Justifica. Sed nuda fiducia misericordiae Divina competit improbis. Ergo. Major conceditur, Minor probatur ex Mic. 3. 11. Esa. 48. 1, 2.

My Lord, A Concession, or a Denial, or a distinction explain'd with as much brevity as is us'd in in the School-Disputations, as it will be less Troublesome to your Lordship, so is it as much as Modesty in me can expect from you, who have so many Avocations to call you off.

I will now, my Lord, crave leave, and I beseech you be not offended at it, for it concerneth me to hint a mistake or two of yours in your Writings, which are very obvious. P. 2. [4. But, to let all these pass, you add that in the 39 Articles there is not one Syllable, you know of, against justification by works, for say you, Article 11. speaks only against justification by our own works or deservings, which are quite another thing. These are your words, which I confess I wonder at.]

at.] If these be my words, I confess your Lordship may well wonder at them, and impute non-sence to me, therefore as you *Ibid. Lin. ult.* but I profess in *verbo sacerdotis* the words are not so in my Copy, but thus, Art. 11. speaks only against justification *for* our own works, now if it be *by* in your Copy, it was my oversight, and I do here again cry you Mercy; if it be *for*, as I suppose it is, then it is both Sense and Truth, but *by* makes it both false and non-sence. P. 40. [‘ And hence you may see how inconsiderately you write, when you say that ‘ it is not Christ’s Righteousness, which ‘ the Apostle saith is imputed, but Righteousness, that is, as you say, Pardon ‘ of our Sins; and yet in the very next ‘ words you say, that our Sins are Pardon’d for the sake of Christ’s Righteousness, where you evidently contradict ‘ your self.] My words are these. ‘ ‘Tis ‘ not imputing Christ’s Righteousness, ‘ but imputing Righteousness, which is ‘ there (*viz. Rom. 4.*) mention’d, which is ‘ the same with Pardon, or justification, ‘ and this for the sake of Christ’s Righteousness. And the meaning is evident, not that part of the Phrase, *viz. Righteousness*, as your Lordship misapprehended, but the whole phrase, *viz.*

imputing Righteousness is the same as Pardon or Justification, which Pardon or Justification is always for the sake of Christ's Righteousness. P. *Ibid.* ['You say Christ's Righteousness is not imputed for Pardon of our Sins.] My words do only contradict the opinion of some that do assert a bi-form justification, partly in Remission of Sins, and partly in imputation of Christ's Righteousness; of which neither Homily nor Scripture says any thing. Nor do I remember any such phrase as *imputing Christ's Righteousness* in either of them. Now sure a Man may say all this, and yet hold the imputation of Christ's Righteousness notwithstanding; my own opinion is, that for the sake of Christ's Righteousness we are reputed Righteous: if this be the same with the imputation of Christ's Righteousness, I do Cordially own it: if there be any thing more in that phrase, I do not yet understand it, nor do I contradict it. P. *Ibid.* ['It is, saith the Text, his Righteousness for the Remission of our (dele our) Sins. The Righteousness of our blessed Saviours Sufferings and Satisfaction was therefore imputed, that for it our Sins might be remitted.] The *his* seems not to relate to Christ, but to God, v. 21, 22. chap. 1. 17. For tho^t

God,

God, and Christ be (in some respects) the same; yet God (as the party wrong'd) and Christ (as the party satisfying for the wrong) are in this argument distinguish'd, as Reverend Mr. Tho. Gataker in his Posthumous Discourse on Rom. 3. 28. p. 34. hath well observ'd. By this, my Lord, you have a small Specimen of your own fallibility, and see that in your Writings, *vox hominem sonat ter in una pagina*. But I will proceed no further in so ungrateful a work.

My Lord, I have herewith sent you an Abstract, or Synopsis of a Discourse of my own, which hath been the fruit of Seven Years Study, which I humbly request you to peruse: and to you I send it, rather than any Man else I know. 1. Because you are so well skill'd, not only in all other, but in this part of Learning also. 2. Because of my Relation to you as my Diocesan. If your Lordship, upon the perusal hereof, hath any mind to see the work at large, or any part of it, I will gladly send it you: if not, I desire you to restore my Papers again. For brevity I have omitted herein to give Learned Men their Titles of respect; but I have done so in the Book itself; neither is it severe against any

Man, but Dr. *Is. Vossius*, and that towards the end. Your Papers, My Lord, have represented me so stupid, that, upon the reading of them, I was much discouraged from ever sending you these Writings; for I thought you could not have any good opinion of any thing of mine, who have judged my former attempt so very weak, impertinent and erroneous all along; but upon Second thoughts I resolved to cast my self upon your Candour, which is so generally acknowledged; and the consideration of that good and Christian Temper (besides the great Learning) which you oft discover in your Papers, did animate me thereunto. I confess the pains that you have bestow'd upon me, considering your High and my low degree, are very obliging to me, and shall certainly have this effect upon me, if they have no other (for I doubt, it will not change my judgment, which yet shall not be for want of diligence to find out the Truth) to make me ready to do you any Service to my Poor Power; and though it should do me no good at all, yet will it be very acceptable to God in you, who did really aim at my good; and to Him I leave it, to requite you for it:

And

to *Bishop* Barlow.

193

And wishing the continuance of your
Life and Health here, with your Eternal
Happinefs hereafter, I Rest,

My Lord,

Your most obliged Servant,

J. W.

Bishop

Bishop *BARLOW's*

Second LETTER

OF

JUSTIFICATION.

S I R,

I Received your Letter, and Read it, with much more satisfaction and comfort than I did your former. The Modesty, Calm, and Christian Temper expressed in your last, and the free promise you have made (and will, I doubt not, make good) to obey the friendly Admonition I gave you, make much for your Credit and my Comfort: and whenever there is an opportunity, wherein

wherein I may assist, or promote your Spiritual or Temporal good; you shall find me very willing (and may be able) to give you (what you have given me) some comfort and satisfaction. The Papers, I sent to you, had (I am sure) no ends but only Truth and your benefit; and in Writing them, *Si quid humanitus exciderit*, if any too Passionate or imprudent passage fell from my Pen, (which might offend or any way discourage you) *nollem dictum*; I desire (what you desire, and have of me) your pardon and prayers; and if you knew my many troublesome businesses, and more infirmities, you would have reason to believe, I needed them. I perceive the papers, I sent, have not given you that satisfaction, I hop'd they would; and possibly (upon second thoughts and impartial consideration) may. I do not desire you should believe me, (or any papers of mine) further than the reasons given may deserve your belief and assent. May the most gracious God of Truth illuminate our understandings (yours and mine) that we may see, and impartially assent to Truth; and sanctify our Wills and Affections, that we may love, and (all by-ends and interests laid aside) sincerely con-

confess it. He who thinks to save any thing by his Religion, beside his Soul, will be a looser in the end. For your 6 doubts, which you mention, and desire me to take no advantage by them. 1. It is your good (not your loss in the least) which I seek. 2. If therefore I can take any advantage of any thing for your benefit, I shall both willingly and sincerely do it; but for your hurt, you may be sure, I shall never do it. 3. For your doubts themselves; I am sorry such little objections (which are indeed inconsequent, and impertinent) should occasion any doubt in you of so great, and so evident a Truth. 4. Had you read, and impartially consider'd the papers sent you; you might have found (as I am at present perswaded) a just answer to all these your objections, which it seems occasion your doubt of the position I defend; and to these papers I might refer you. 5. But for your further satisfaction, I shall give you a short answer to each particular reason you alledge against that Truth I defend. And here your first reason, to prove we are justified by our inherent Righteousness, is this,

1. Objection.

1. You say, 'We are justified by Faith, (Rom. 4. 13.) Ergo. by inherent Righteousness.'

To

To this I say, 1. That the Question sol.
only is, what it is, *for which* we are justi-
fied *coram Deo* : or what is the *ratio for-*
malis & motivum propter quod justificamur
coram Deo, & a peccatis absolvimur. And
this is only the *merits and satisfaction of*
our blessed Saviour. He (as our ^a Surety) ^a Heb. 7. 22.
has paid our debt, and the full price of ^c and Heb. 9. 15.
our Redemption ; for which alone we
have justification *coram Deo*, and absolu-
tion from all our Sins. Whence he is
call'd *our Righteousness*. (Jer. 23. 6.
1 Cor. 1. 30.) Faith indeed is the *hand or*
instrument, by which we ^b receive, apply, ^b John 1. 12.
rely upon, and have an interest in his ^{Eph. 3. 17.}
satisfaction ; but 'tis his Blood and Passion
only, and the satisfaction given to his
Father for us, which does, or can *justify*
us, coram Deo. Hence we are said to be
justified *by* ^c his blood ; that is, *by Faith* ^d Rom. 5. 9.
in his blood : And that we are justified ^d Rom. 5. 1. 2.
by ^e the *Redemption which is in Jesus Christ*. ^e Rom. 3. 25.
And we have ^f Redemption through his ^f Eph. 1. 7.
blood, the forgiveness of our Sins. So that
the thing, which only justifies us *coram*
Deo, is the meritorious sufferings and
satisfaction of our blessed Saviour, and not
the habit or acts of Faith, or of any o-
ther vertue or grace whatsoever, which
our Church hath expressly told us ; 1. In
our

g Art. Religio-
nis 11.

our Articles, *We are justified before God only for the merits of Christ*. It says indeed, that 'tis by *Faith*; as by the hand and instrument, which receives Christ, and gives us a Right to his sufferings and satisfaction. But *Faith*, by receiving our blessed Saviour, and his merits and satisfaction for us, does no more justify, than a poor Man's hand receiving 1000 £. from his Benefactor does enrich; or a wounded Man's hand, receiving and applying an excellent plaister from his Surgeon, can be said to Cure: No, 'tis the Money received which does enrich, and the Plaister which does cure, and not the hands which received, or applied them. 2. Our Homilies (if that be possible) more fully in the beginning of the 1. pt. of the *Homily of Salvation*; and in the 2. pt. of that Homily. 3. 'Tis true, the Homily (in the place last named) speaks against the merit of our works, as no way deserving our justification; and so may seem to shut them out from having any hand in our justification, *per modum meriti* only; as the k Homily in that sense shuts out our Faith too. But 'tis evident, both in our Article, and Homilies, that our good works (all of them, save Faith only) are so shut out that they have no hand at all in

h In our Book
of Homilies, p.
13. Editionis
London, 1635
i Ibid. p. 17. 18.

k Hom. p. 18.
lin. 2. & p. 29.
lin. 11. &c.

in our justification: neither as causes for which, nor as conditions or instruments by which our blessed Saviours Merits are made ours. We are justified (says our Article) only for the Merits of Christ. ^{Art. 11.}

And only by Faith. And the Homily says, ^m ' That a lively Faith, and nothing else ^{m Hom. p. 14.} on our part is required to our justification. ^{linea 43.}

4. I grant, that the Apostle says we are justified ⁿ by Faith, and thence you indeed ^{n Rom. 5. 1.} your to infer that we are justified by our inherent Righteousness; seeing Faith (both the act and habit) is *subjective* inherent in us. But this is a manifest mistake. For when Faith is said to justify, (as usually it is) the meaning is not that the habit or act of Faith doth justify us *coram Deo*; for 'tis most certain that we have Remission of Sins (*Eph. 1. 7.*) and so justification (*Rom. 5. 9.*) only by our blessed Saviours Blood, and the Merits of his Passion: But Faith (when 'tis said to justify) is taken for its object, (the merits of Christ) received, relied upon, and applyed by Faith. This is that our Article (Art. 11.) says, That we are justified before God only for the Merits of Christ by Faith. *Satisfactio Christi Remissionem peccati & Justitiam sola apud Deum impetrat; Fides sola applicat merita & satisfactionem Christi, ut nos.*
- tra

tra sint, & nobis ad Justitiam profint.

And in that place you cite, (*Rom. 4. 13.*) where mention is made of the Righteousness of Faith; The meaning is not, that the habit or act of Faith is our inherent Righteousness. But the Righteousness there meant, is the Righteousness of our blessed Saviour perform'd by him (as our Mediator and Surety) in our Stead, and for us; which is inherent in him, and external to us. And this Righteousness is call'd in Scripture. 1. *Justitia Christi, quia ab illo praestita, & in illo subjective inherens.*

2. *Justitia Dei.* (*Rom. 3. 21, 22. &c.*) Who sent his Son to be our Saviour, accepted his satisfaction given for us, and imputes it to us for Remission of Sins and our Justification: Christ is our Righteousness, (says the Prophet) and 'tis God who made him so. *Π ἐξουθὴν ἡμῶν δικαιώσων ἀπὸ Θεοῦ.*

It is of God, that Christ and his Righteousness is imputed and made ours. 3. It is called *Justitia fidei*, because by a lively Faith, it is received, and made ours; as is evident in Scripture, and expressly testified by our Church, which says, Christ's Merits are made ours only by Faith (for the affirmative) and by no other virtue whatsoever, (in the Negative.) But enough (if not too much) of this; which is

o Jer. 23. 6.

p i Cor. 1. 30.

q Rom. 3. 22,
24, 25, 26.

r Art. 11.

s Hom. of Sal-
vation pt. 3. p.
18. linea ulti-
ma.

so far from being any just ground, why you should doubt of the Truth of that Position you deny ; that it affords you not the least probability for it.

Your Second Objection, or reason to ² Objection.

prove justification by works, is, That *credere est operari, ergo. si credendo, etiam operando (seu ex operibus) Justificamur.*

1. This is the same objection (as to the matter of it) with the former, and therefore the answer to that may be sufficient for this. 2. But you had this very objection, in your former Letter, and a distinct and particular answer to it in the Papers, I sent you. Now that answer gave you satisfaction, or not. If it did ; methinks you should not afterwards bring that objection, to which you had before received satisfaction. If not, you ought in reason, to have told me wherein, and why it fail'd ; that so I might have endeavour'd your further satisfaction ; or (if your reasons were cogent) I might have acknowledged it, and have been thankful for your discovery of Truth, and my better information. In the mean time (till you tell me, where it fails, and is faulty) I refer you to my former answer.

In your Third Objection, you endeavour to prove, that the justification spoken

ken of *Jam.* 2. is not declarative, but constitutive, *non coram hominibus Solum, sed coram Deo.* To this, I say. 1. That this was the main objection press'd almost in every part of your former Letter, indeed a miserable and manifest mistake of St. *James* his meaning, which I did largely and particularly prove in my former paper from evident places of Scripture, of which you take no notice. 2. When St. *James* says; That *Abraham* was Justified by works, when he offer'd Isaac, it is manifest. 1. That this act of offering his Son, was an act of a lively and justifying Faith, (*Heb.* 11.

† *Gen.* 12. 14.
Heb. 11. 8.

17.) by which he was^t justified *coram Deo*, above 40 Years before, and stood then actually justified when he offer'd up his Son; so that it was as impossible for that act to justify him, as to do a thing which was actually done before. 2 As good

* *Mat.* 7. 16,
17, 18.

A corrupt Tree
cannot bring
forth good fruit.
Men do not gather
figs of Thistles.

u 1 *John* 2. 29.

& *Eph.* 2. 10.

We must be created
in Christ.

Jesus (new
Creatures) before
we can do
any good work.

Fruit necessarily presupposes the * Tree good from whence it comes; so good and just works (especially such an excellent work as that of *Abraham's* offering his Son) of necessity pre-suppose the Person good and just who does them; or (as St. *John* expresseth it) a Person born of God and Regenerate; and therefore antecedently just before God, before we can do any good work. And ergo. it was

ne-

necessary that *Abraham* should be a justified person, before it was possible for him to do such an act of Heroick Piety : and if he was *coram Deo* actually justifi'd before, then 'tis impossible the oblation of his Son should justify him *coram Deo* ; though *coram hominibus* it might, and really did justify him. But much more evidence of this Truth you have in the former papers, and to them I might refer you. 3. You endeavour to prove the justification of *Abraham* spoken of by *Paul* (Rom. 4.) and by *James*, (cap. 2. 21.) to be one and the same justification constitutive, and *coram Deo*, which is a strange and unadvised attempt : For the justification of *Abraham* *Paul* speaks of (as is evident in the Text) is a justification, by Faith without works by the imputation of an external Righteousness : and *Abraham's* justification *St. James* mentions, is by works only, an inherent (without any external imputed) Righteousness : which are so different, and *e diametro* oppos'd, that you may as well unite the opposite poles, reconcile contradictions, and do impossibilities, as prove the justification of *Abraham*, Rom. 4. to be the same with that *Jam.* 2. 21. And for the two Texts you bring, (*Jam.* 2. 14, 23.) I cannot

w Abraham
 was justified
 by Faith, when
 he left Haran.
 Heb. 11. 8.
 then he was
 75 Years Old.
 Gen. 12. 4.
 And Isaac was
 not born till
 Abraham was
 100 years old.

not imagine, why you should think, they
 can any way prove your purpose; or
 that they relate to *Abraham's* justification
 by works in Sacrificing his Son. Seeing
 the former place (*Jam. 2. 14.*) is evi-
 dently impertinent, and the second place
 (*Jam. 2. 23.*) speaks of *Abraham's* justifi-
 cation by Faith 25 Years ^w before he had
 a Son, and (at least) 41 Years before he
 offer'd him. For (according to our
 most approved and received Chronology,
Abraham offer'd his Son, *Anno atatis sue.*
 116. which was 41 Years after his de-
 parting out of *Haran*, and so after his
 justification by Faith *coram Deo*. And if
 yet you doubt, (till I know some reason
 why you do so) I must refer you to my
 former papers.

4 Objection.

In your 4th. Objection (or doubt) you
 endeavour to prove that justification con-
 sists in Remission of Sins: But, to what
 purpose you take pains to prove this, I
 know not: For I have never yet met
 with any, who denies it; I am sure, I do
 not.

5 Objection.

In your Fifth Objection, wherein the
 Position you endeavour to prove, is this,
 That *Obedientiâ Christianâ justificamur.*
 That we are justified by our own Christi-
 an obedience (for that is, and must be
 the

the meaning of it) Now to this; I say,
1. That I am exceedingly troubled that
you (or any of my Brethren) should as-
sert such a Position, in derogation of our
blessed Saviours obedience (by which al-
one we are, or can be justified) and pre-
sumption of your own, which (what-
ever it be) is far short of any possibility
to justify you *coram Deo*. 2. I am
troubled that you should urge such places
of Scripture for the proof of your Positi-
on; which I dare, and do say, either
you never Read, or did not seriously and
impartially consider, or (at least) un-
derstood them not. For I do say (and
know) that they are so far from proving
your position, that they prove the con-
trary: and presuppose that justification
already past, for attaining whereof (you
say) those works are to be done. 3. Your
Position (chuse you which you please)
is either Popish or Socinian; against ex-
press Scripture, and the receiv'd Sense and
Judgment of the Ancient, and all Reform'd
Churches; some reasons of this I now
say, (when you have time, and a mind
impartially to consider them) you may
find in the papers I sent you. 4. In the
mean time, pray consider what the Apo-
stle says; That it is the * *Obedience of our* Rom. 9. 19.
blessed

blessed Saviour (not our own) by which
 y Rom. 5. 18, we are made Righteous; and his y Right-
 teousness (not our own) by which we
 are justified. He was obedient (for us)
 to Death, the Death of the Cross; and
 by this Obedience and his Blood we have
 z Remission of our Sins, and a justificati-
 on. 5. Whatever justifies us, must (of
 necessity) precede, and be antecedent to
 our Justification; but our Christian Obe-
 dience (which you say, justifies us) is
 an effect and consequent of a lively Faith
 and justification; as our b Article (which
 you have subscribed) expressly tells you;
 and has evident ground in c Scripture for
 it. 6. The first place you bring (Rom.
 6. 19.) to prove that we are injoyn'd
 by God to perform Christian Obedience,
ut exinde justitiam obtineamus. Now (says
 the Apostle there) *Yield your Members Ser-*
vants to Righteousness, unto Holiness.
 Whence you would infer that the Ro-
 mans (to whom he writes) were to be
 Servants to Righteousness, and perform
 Christian Obedience, to the end that they
 might be justified by it. But here you
 miserably mistake the Text, and the
 Apostles meaning, (which is hardly pos-
 sible for any man to do, who reads, and
 impartially considers it) for 'tis evi-
 dent,

z Eph. 1. 7.

Col. 1. 14.

a Rom. 5. 9.

Rom. 3. 24.

25.

b Art. Religi-
on, 12.

c Heb. 11. per
scriptum.

dent, that the Apostle writes to those who were ^d called to be Saints, and were beloved ^d Rom. 1. 7. of God; to those who were ^e freed from ^e Rom. 6. 22. Sin, and Justified, and so become the Servants of God. 2. He exhorts these to Christian Obedience, and works of Righteousness that they would yield their Members *f* δῶλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, Servants to Righteousness, (not *eis* δικαιοσύνῃ to be justified ^f Rom. 6. 19 The place you cite. by that obedience, but) *eis* ἀγιασμῶν for their Sanctification. He expressly says, that they were justified already; and then exhorts them to good works, which (as fruits of a justifying Faith) might concur to their Sanctification. The Apostles words are to this purpose most plain and evident, But now (says the Apostle) being made free from Sin, (justified) and ^g Rom. 6. 22. become Servants to God; you have your fruit *eis* ἀγιασμῶν to Sanctification, and the end everlasting Life. So that the Apostle here exhorts the Romans to the doing good works of Christian obedience, not to be justified by them, (as you pretend) for he expressly says that they were justified before. They were not to do them, *eis* δικαιοσύνῃ, to be justified by them, (that had been for your purpose, but he says it not) but *eis* ἀγιασμῶν, in order to their Sanctification, and as Fruits, (so he expressly

presly calls them) of that Faith, by which they were before justified. So that this place had better been omitted, seeing it is a proof (not for, but) against your position

The second place you bring to prove That God requires Christian obedience of us, to that end that we may be justified by it, is this, *b For with the Heart man believeth unto Righteousness, and with the Mouth Confession is made unto Salvation.* Here 1. I cannot imagine what reason you can have to produce this place. For sure I am, it is impossible by this Text, to prove your Position. 2. Had the Apostle said; 'That with the Heart Man believeth, and with the Mouth confession is made unto Righteousness, or justification: it might have been some proof of your Position. But this he does not say, but rather the contrary. That the Heart believeth to Righteousness or justification; which is most consonant to St. Paul's Doctrine and the Truth of Scripture; Faith (as our Homily tells you) being the only condition, on our part, required to our justification, and no other works: But confession (he says) is required (not to justification, but only) to Salvation. But although this place nei-

ther

i Hom. of Salvation, pt. 1. p. 14.

ther do, nor can make any thing for your purpose, and Hypothesis; yet it makes much for mine. And affords a just ground for a distinction, which I desire you would (and it may concern you to) consider. 'Tis this, Things may be pre-required as *Media vel conditiones: vel* 1. *Ad Justitiam. Vel* 2. *Ad Gloriam.* For the 1. we say, that Faith is necessarily pre-required, *ad Justitiam*; it (and only it) beeing pre-required on our part, for the Application of our blessed Saviours Merits and Satisfaction, and so for our Justification by them, (as our *k* Article tells *k* Art. ii. you, and our *l* Homily, too) For the 2. *l* In our Homilies, p. 14. and p. 18. in calce utriusq; pagina. *m* Art. 12. we say, That universal sincere obedience, and all manner of good works, (which our Article *m* calls the necessary effects and consequents of that lively Faith, which justifies us) are (in all who do come to Years of discretion) necessarily pre-required as *Media antecedentia in ordine ad gloriam*, (though not *ad Justitiam*) they are *via regni, non causa regnandi.* Good works and Holiness are so pre-required *ad gloriam*, as without them, *n* no *n* Heb. 12. 14. *Man shall see the Lord.* Lastly, the last *l* Tim. 4. 8. place you refer me to is as little to your purpose and proof of your position. (*Rom.* 2. 13.) where the Apostle says, *Not the*
bearers,

hearers, but the doers of the Law shall be Justified before God. Where 1. This is most true *de Justitia legali*; when the condition is, *Fac hoc & vives*. Fulfilling of the Law, and perfect good works, is the condition required to legal Righteousness; but not so to Evangelical, of which only you should speak. I say, doing of the Law (and legal works) is no condition pre-required of us by God for our Justification. The New Covenant is *fœdus Gratia, non operum*. A Covenant whereby God justifies the ungodly, (*Rom. 4. 5.*) And to the true Believer, imputes Righteousness without works. (*Rom. 4. 6.*) These things I have said for your sake only, for these places (having no appearance of proof) deserve no answer. —

6 Objection.

In your last objection you endeavour to prove, that, *Fides Justifica non est nuda fiducia misericordie*. But this is impertinent, for none I know, affirm it, I am sure I do not; nor the Church of England, which requires necessarily the presence of Hope, Love, Penitence, and other vertues in *homine Justificato*, though not their concurrence *ad Justificationem*. The words of the Homily are these, (and worth your consideration.) ‘Though all these Vertues are present together in him

o Hom. of Salvation, 1 st. p.
14. 15.

‘him who is justified, yet they justify not
 ‘altogether. Nor doth Faith shut out
 ‘the Justice of good works, which are
 ‘necessary to be done afterwards, (pray
 consider that our Church believes (and
 you and I having subscribed her Doc-
 trine should believe it too) that good
 works are not antecedent causes or con-
 ditions of our justification, but necessary
 effects and consequents of it, *qua sequun-
 tur Justificatum, non antecedunt Justifican-
 dum*, and therefore neither do, nor can
 constitute us just, but pre-suppose us just
 before they have any being. But it shuts
 out good works, so that we may not do
 them to this intent to be made just by
 them. This is the plain Doctrine of our
 Holy Mother, the Church of *England*;
 and it will concern you (and me) to con-
 sider, how you can reconcile what you
 positively affirm in your 5th. objection
 with this Doctrine of our Church. *Obedi-
 entia Christiana* (say you) *Divinitus no-
 bis præcipitur, ut exinde Justitiam obtineamus.*
 We may not do good works, to the end
 to be justified by them, (says your Mo-
 ther the Church of *England*) we must do
 them (say you) and God has command-
 ed that we should do them to that end.
 You must either recant this your Teme-
 rarious

various and erroneous position, (for evidently so it is) or if not, you will (which will no way become you) stand in open defiance to your Mother, and contradiction to her Doctrine, which you have subscribed; which renders you (by express Law) liable to Excommunication, and Deprivation. Pray consider it.

In your 2. page, number 4. you say, the words in your former Letter were these, 'The 11. Article speaks only against justification for our own works; and 'then you add; if it be *for*, (as you suppose it is) then it is both Sense and Truth; but *by* makes it both false, and non sense. 1. I confess it is *for* in the Letter you sent me, as you say it is in your Copy. 2. But let it be *for*, or *by* works; your position is equally untrue. For if you say; we are justified for works; or we are justified by works; both these assertions contradict the 11th Article, which says expressly, That we are justified before God, only for the Merits of Christ; and only by Faith, whence it evidently follows (if our Article be true) that we cannot be justified either for, or by works. So that by your assertion (as your self state it) you evidently contradict our Article, (and the Truth by you subscribed) which
ex-

expresly says, That we are justified, only by Faith; and you say; that we are justified by works. And then (if this assertion be true) the Article is false; which says, we are justified only by Faith: for certainly the works (by which you say we are justified) are another thing, and distinct from Faith.—

After this you would seem to say something in defence of what you said in your former Letter against the imputation of our blessed Saviours Righteousness in our justification: but what your meaning is, (or how what you say, consists with Truth, or your own other assertions) I confess I cannot understand; and so I shall leave that matter to my former, and your Second thoughts.

I have Read, and (with my thanks) return you the Synopsis of your Tract of Chronology: The Heads you handle are many, of great consequence, and disposed into a good Method; but I need not tell you that a satisfactory Determination of all the Questions proposed by you (both in Philosophy concerning the nature of Time and quantity in general, and in Chronology concerning the several *Æra* or *Epochæ*) will be *Periculosa plenum opus aleæ*, a very hard and difficult Task. I
thank

thank you for your kind offer to communicate your whole work to me, and when our publick busineses are over here, and I settled in some quiet at *Buckden*, I should be glad to see you and your Chronological Tract there, where you shall be welcome so,

Your Loving Friend

and Brother,

5 MA 56 T. L.

London, Sept. 7. 1678.

FINIS.

The Reader is desired to excuse and mend with his Pen, some at least of the following Errata, occasion'd in part, by the Publishers great distance from the Press.

E R R A T A.

IN the Preface, p. 1. l. penult. r. *Condescension*. p. 2. l. 6. r. *these*. p. 5. l. 1. r. *Controversial*. p. 10. l. 6. between the words *working* and *it is*, add the figure 3.

PAge 4. l. 11. r. *whereon*. p. 7. l. 17. d. *all*. p. 8. l. 7. after any add *of*. p. 12. l. 16. r. *there*. p. 13. l. 13. r. *Witchcot*. p. 15. l. 16. r. *Neo*. p. 16. l. 3. after *same* add *as*. p. 19. l. 3. d. *shall*. l. 6. for *Trial* r. *Legal*. l. 19. r. *Univerſity*. p. 21. l. 28. for *in* r. *is*. p. 27. l. 4. r. *Justificationem*. l. 5. r. *Meretur*. p. 24. l. 24. r. *ergo*. p. 29. l. 13. before *lays* r. *which*. l. 20. for *Redere* r. *Credere*.
 — In the Margent for *with* r. *With*. p. 31. l. 16. r. *is*.
 — In the Margent l. 6. r. *Camero*. l. 15. r. *nisi Sola*. p. 32. l. 11. r. *is*. l. 21. r. *ſidelis*. l. 22. r. *Justitiam*. p. 32. In the Margent. l. 3. r. *fidem*. l. 6. r. *Justitia*. l. 8. for *passuat* r. *possunt*. for *peccatum* r. *peccata*. l. 9. for *prima* r. *primus*. l. 10. r. *ad Deum est per fidem*. for *Anguinus* r. *Aquinas*. p. 35. l. 17. r. *Quid*. p. 37. l. 17. r. *acknowledged*. l. 21. r. *knew*. p. 43. l. 20. r. *preceding*. p. 44. l. 5. & 7. r. *promised*. l. 7. r. *hoc et*. l. 8. d. *and*.
 — In the Margent l. 2. r. *Quest*. l. 3. r. *Simpl*. p. 45. l. 26. r. *justitiam*. p. 48. l. antep. r. *grounded*. p. 50. l. 24. r. *exert*. — In the Margent r. *ἰνὰ τὴν ἀγάπην*. (dele and) *Photius Oecumenius, vide & Theodoretum*. p. 51. l. 6. r. *καταργησέναι*. l. 9. r. *ad Gloriam, quam precedunt*. l. 10. r. *sequuntur*. l. 17. r. *The*. p. 53. l. antep. r. *of*. p. 55. l. 15. r. *premises*. p. 57. l. 27. r. *qua*. p. 59. l. 22. r. *no*. p. 61. l. 16. & 17. r. *impertinent*. l. 28. r. *speak*. p. 62. l. 15. r. *in*. p. 65. l. 11. r. *principle*. l. 18. *ἰνὰ τὴν ἀγάπην*. l. 21. r. *tradendis*. p. 68. in the Margent, r. *aperte significat, quod per justitiam operum nullus*. p. 71. l. 3. r. *convertere*. l. 6. r. *adificij*. l. 7. r. & — In the Margent l. 1. r. *Cincillium*. p. 72. l. 13. r. *as*. l. ult. a. *between*. p. 76. in the Margent l. 1. r. *the*. l. 2. r. *Flac*. l. 3. r. *Cardinal*. l. 5. r. *the*. l. 6. r. *veraciter*. l. 9. r. *which*. l. 15. r. *pra*.

r. *presentis*. p. 77. l. 1. r. *d. think*. p. 78. l. 12. r. *dē-*
duction. p. 82. l. 16. r. *different*. p. 86. l. 4. r. *tells us*.
p. 87. l. 9. r. *imputed*. p. 88. l. 28. r. *συνήγες*. p. 98. l.
8. r. *d. cujus*. p. 99. l. 14. r. *Dei*. p. 110. l. 27. for *infirm*
r. in *form*. p. 129. l. 2. r. *ἀλλυγέας*. p. 158. l. 27. r.
that. p. 163. In the Margent. l. 22. r. *Estius*. l. 31. r.
ἀγαπούντων. p. 185. l. 17. for *opinion* as r. *opinions*.

5 MA 56

r. de-
lls us.
98. l.
infirm
27. r.
31. r.

